The American Ecclesiastical Review

Vol. CXIV, No. 1 January, 1946

CONTENTS

The "Meaning" of the Springfield Plan *Edmond Darvil Benard* 1

The Parish Priest and the Returning Soldier *Charles F. Suver, S.J.* 13

Grievance. Part II . . . *Thomas Owen Martin* 17

Peace in Unity . . . *Gregory Figueroa, S.A.* 30

Preserving the Faith Inviolate . *Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R.* 34

The Deaf Apostolate . . . . *George J. Haye* 48

Nature and the Supernatural Life . *Joseph Clifford Fenton* 54

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Singing the Correct *Ite Missa Est* 69

Tone of Voice at Mass 69

Solemn Mass with Only One Missal 70

The Use of a Funeral Pall 70

Contents Continued on Next Page

Published monthly by The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C. Subscription price, currency: United States, $4.00; Canada, $4.50; Foreign, $5.00. 40 cents per copy.

Entered as second class matter, November 30, 1944, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Accepted for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for under Act of March 5, 1930, under Act of February 28, 1925.

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C.

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, Box 20A, The Catholic University of America, Washington 17, D. C.

Copyright 1945, by The Catholic University of America Press

Contents Continued from Previous Page

Omission of a Similar Commemoration 71
Required Hymns at Benediction 72
Which Ordo? 72
Intention of the Prayers after Mass 73
Banns for the Convalidation of a Marriage 73
Conditions for the Rosary Indulgences 74

BOOK REVIEWS

A Companion to the New Testament,
by John E. Steinmueller and Kathryn Sullivan 75
The Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, *by Martin B. Hellriegel* . 76
St. Bernard, the Man and His Message, *by Watkin Williams* 78
BOOK NOTES 80

CHANGE OF ADDRESS

We Solicit Your Co-operation

Notice of change of address should be sent to us promptly, and at the same time the old address should be given.

Sometimes a subscriber overlooks reporting change of address; and now and then a subscriber dies, and in either case his copy continues to be sent to his former address. In such cases notification from Successor or Pastor would be appreciated.

You May Use the Blank Below:

NAME: .....

OLD ADDRESS: .....

NEW ADDRESS: .....

OTHER INFORMATION: .....

The American Ecclesiastical Review
The Catholic University of America
Washington 17, D. C.

THE "MEANING" OF THE SPRINGFIELD PLAN

It would seem that any movement whose purpose is to eliminate racial and religious bigotry and to promote a spirit of mutual understanding among the various constituent groups in an American community could hardly be praised too much. In the city of Springfield, Massachusetts, a program with just such a goal was inaugurated six years ago. It is a program of "education for democratic citizenship," reaching the children of the city through all levels of the public school system and adults through the adult education courses and the Parent-Teachers associations. The initial work of planning was done by a committee named from the personnel of the public school system by Dr. John Granrud, until very recently superintendent of schools in the city. This committee included among its members Catholics, Protestants, and Jews. Several books and magazine articles, a great number of newspaper stories, and two motion picture short subjects have given nation-wide publicity to the "Springfield Plan."

Very probably, adaptations of the Springfield Plan, conformed to local conditions and needs, will sooner or later be in operation in many cities of the United States. The assistance of Catholic priests and Catholic educators will be requested; their advice will be asked, and their suggestions considered. This is why the underlying philosophy and operational methods of the Springfield Plan will be important in localities far from the New England city that has given the Plan its name.

The obvious good points of the Springfield program are by now widely recognized, and this is not just another article in praise of them. We are concerned with the attitude of the Springfield Plan towards religion, as set forth in what must be considered as the most authoritative of the books written about the Plan. This book was published some months ago by Barnes and Noble, Inc., of New York. It is called *The Story of the Springfield Plan*, and was written by Clarence I. Chatto and Alice L. Halligan of the Springfield public school system. It contains an Introduction signed by Clyde R. Miller of the Columbia University Teachers College, who acted, according to the book, as "consultant" to the Springfield program. It is obviously a book to which many will turn for information about the basic aims of the Springfield Plan

and about its methods of operation. And while much of *The Story of the Springfield Plan* makes interesting, even inspiring reading, every Catholic must take grave exception to certain of the passages dealing with religion.

There is, first of all, the matter of Professor Miller's Introduction. This Introduction is no mere, conventional, laudatory essay. It is entitled "The Meaning," with the result that it will be accepted by most readers as really setting forth the basic goals of the Springfield program. The review of *The Story of the Springfield Plan* in the New York *Herald Tribune* for Aug. 19, 1945, which first called the attention of the present writer to the book, was devoted principally to what the reviewer called "the plan's essentials"—the four major points developed by Professor Miller.

This "hard-hitting progressive educator" (as *Common Sense* for October, 1945, describes him) hails the Springfield Plan as an attempt to eliminate "four fatal delusions" from American life. Three of these delusions are the ideas that one race is superior, that one class is superior, and that one group can obtain for itself more of the goods and opportunities of the world if it denies them to other groups. Everyone will agree with Professor Miller that these delusions should be eliminated and the ideals of political, economic, and social democracy substituted in their stead. But Professor Miller, in his Introduction, also makes an incursion into the field of religion. He expresses his religious philosophy in an unfortunate passage—a brief passage but one with an importance out of all proportion to its length. It brings us squarely up against an issue that must be faced openly and honestly by both Catholics and non-Catholics who would co-operate in any program similar to the Springfield Plan.

The religious "delusion" is the first "delusion" on Professor Miller's list, and his description of it is not a happy one. This is what he writes: "*The first is the delusion that one's own church, cult, sect, or group alone expresses God's will on earth, that it alone can reveal God's purposes toward mankind. We have seen this delusion in the Shintoism of Japan, in Emperor worship. The Emperor is divine, and treason against the nation is blasphemy against God. But this delusion has not been confined to the Japanese*" (p. xv).

Can there be any reasonable doubt that in this paragraph

Professor Miller has in mind the Catholic Church? Catholics certainly do believe that the Catholic Church is the one, true, and only Church established by Jesus Christ, and that the Catholic Church, under the direction of the Roman Pontiff, the Vicar of Christ, is the infallible custodian and teacher of God's revelation to men. No one can deny this and still remain a Catholic. Is this one of the "fatal delusions" that the Springfield Plan is pledged to eradicate?

Professor Miller gives as an example of this "delusion" the Emperor worship of Japan, but the Japanese Emperor seems, in this context, to be something of a straw man. The Springfield Plan is hardly aimed at stamping Shintoism out of Springfield, Massachusetts. As applied to Springfield, or to the United States, the real point of Professor Miller's paragraph seems to come in its last sentence: "But this delusion has not been confined to the Japanese." What is the point of the innuendo? Who has been guilty of this "delusion"? Every Catholic, without exception, to whom we have shown this passage has agreed that the imputation is directed against the Catholic Church. And Allan P. Farrell, S.J., reviewing *The Story of the Springfield Plan* in the *America* issue of Sept. 1, 1945, comments on the manner in which Professor Miller "displays all too plainly the common inability of the secularized Protestant mind to think straight on religion." "I am afraid," Fr. Farrell concludes his review, "that the innuendo beneath this jumbled thinking is that the delusion of possessing God's seamless garment of truth is also held, alas! by the Catholic Church."

In order to be absolutely fair, let us concede the possibility that the distinguished educator from Columbia did not have the Catholic Church in mind when he wrote this paragraph. We must then arrive at the uncomfortable conclusion that the "consultant" to a program one purpose of which is to promote *understanding* among religious groups did not know enough about Catholicism to realize that in his words there was a clear implication that a basic teaching of the Catholic Church is a "delusion" fatal to the American way of life.

It must be pointed out at once that Professor Miller's religious philosophy formed no part of the original statement of purpose drafted by Dr. Granrud's committee. The "tentative objectives" unanimously adopted by that committee are listed on pp. 6-7 of

The Story of the Springfield Plan. They are unexceptionable, and will command the respect and sympathy of Catholic and non-Catholic alike. The same may be said for the "definite objectives" (pp. 20-21). It is surely a worthy educational project, for instance, to help school children to "understand all the constituent groups of our population, the historical backgrounds of these groups, and their contributions to American life" (p. 6). It is a high goal "to bring to every child respect for all persons, for that inherent dignity and worth that are their birthright—in a democracy; experience in wholesome and natural relationships with children of different races, nationalities, and religions; friendly association with the children and teachers of private and parochial schools; opportunity to bear a share of responsibility for the welfare of the class and the school; experience in discussion and group thinking; opportunity to exercise leadership and to cultivate the ability to follow intelligently as well as to lead; the development of desirable social behavior: courtesy, consideration, thoughtfulness" (p. 20).

As nearly as we can determine, then, Professor Miller's religious philosophy has been imposed *post factum* on a program of which it certainly does not express the "meaning." But the danger is that readers of *The Story of the Springfield Plan* will regard Professor Miller's indifferentist philosophy as a necessary presupposition for any such program of education for democratic living. The main purpose of this article is to attempt to ward off the danger of such misapprehension; it is certainly no part of our purpose to "attack" the Springfield Plan as originally conceived.

Those men and women who have given generously of their time and labor to further the objectives of the Springfield Plan or any similar program would, we feel, be the last ones to resent a statement of the attitude which a Catholic must take with regard to the religious aspect of such a program. It is with this confidence that we turn from Professor Miller's Introduction to a consideration of certain features of the Springfield Plan's operation, as set forth in the body of the book we are discussing. We feel obliged to point out that certain projects and practices regarding religion are contrary to the teaching of the Catholic Church and cannot be acceptable to Catholics.

On pp. 67-70 of *The Story of the Springfield Plan*, we read of the "glittering miniature tree" standing on a table beside the teacher's desk in a junior high school classroom. The tree is explained in

the words of the students, of which the following are excerpts: "This tree shows the different religions the people of the world have believed in. The bottom branches are for the older religions. Each prism stands for a different faith . . . . This top branch is Christianity. It has three prisms which stand for three Christian faiths, Protestant, Roman Catholic, and Greek Catholic. All the prisms are the same size and they all shine with the same brightness, because every religion is equally important to the people who believe in it."

It is difficult to see how an eighth-grade school child, with this model before him, would not be led to consider the Catholic Church as just one religion among many, all equally valid for the soul's salvation, and equally pleasing to God. The top branch, with its three prisms, certainly places Catholicism, Protestantism, and Greek Orthodoxy on exactly the same level. It is an exceedingly vivid presentation of the objectionable "branch theory." All the prisms are the same size and all shine with the same brightness (therefore it would seem to follow that all religions are pretty much the same essentially) "because every religion is equally important to the people who believe in it."

But all this is directly contrary to Catholic teaching. The Catholic Church believes and insists that there is only *one* true religion, not many; it has never fallen into the naive error of holding that a number of religions, all mutually contradictory, can be, by some logical miracle, equally true. Catholicism, Protestantism, and Greek Orthodoxy are not all equal branches of Christianity. The only true Christian Church is the Catholic Church; all others calling themselves Christian are either in heresy or in schism from the one true Church of Christ.

To represent all religions by the same objective symbols "because every religion is equally important to the people who believe in it" certainly implies a false criterion of religious values. We might, with perfect consistency if this is to be our standard, hang another prism on the tree, of the same size and brightness, to signify atheism. Why not?

Remember, we are considering the effect that this sort of religious "tree" will have upon children of twelve or thirteen years. It is a vivid symbol, reducing Catholicism to the same level of importance as heretical, schismatical, and pagan beliefs. It represents a definite religious concept—distinctly not the

Catholic one. There can be no doubt whatsoever that the impression it will convey to the mind of a child is a real danger to his Catholic faith.

On p. 72 of *The Story of the Springfield Plan* we read: "At the request of a number of her pupils, a Jewish teacher took them to the services at her synagogue and explained the meaning of what they saw." The authors do not say whether there were Catholic children in the group, and we do not know whether Catholic children in the Springfield schools ever actually form part of such interfaith groups attending non-Catholic services. But perhaps we should indicate the teaching of the Catholic Church on this point. (It would make no difference, of course, whether the non-Catholic services were Jewish or Protestant or any other sort: the same rule holds good.)

The law of the Catholic Church governing attendance at non-Catholic services is very clear. According to Canon 1258 of the Code of Canon Law: "It is not lawful for the faithful in any way whatsoever actively to assist or to take part in the rites of non-Catholics. Passive or merely material presence can be tolerated for the sake of civil duty or honor, on account of a grave reason, to be approved by the bishop in case of doubt, at the marriages, funerals, and similar solemnities of non-Catholics, provided that the danger of perversion and scandal is not present." For a Catholic child or a number of Catholic children to attend non-Catholic services (even though their attendance be merely passive) as part of an interfaith group such as is referred to in *The Story of the Springfield Plan* would certainly seem to fall under this prohibition. All the theologians we have consulted on this point agree that such attendance could not be assimilated to the exceptions allowed by the Code.

Of course, if a non-Catholic or number of non-Catholics, adults or children, wish to attend Mass in a Catholic church and then have the service explained to them by a priest, there would be no objection from the Catholic standpoint. (Such a visit is described on p. 72 of *The Story of the Springfield Plan.*) Non-Catholics might consider this an illogical position, in view of the prohibition set forth in the Code regarding the attendance of Catholics at non-Catholic services. In reality, it is eminently logical. The Church welcomes those who wish to know more about her teachings and practices, because the Catholic Church is the true

Church, the one to which all men are obliged to belong; and she knows that the more non-Catholics understand about her, the greater is the attraction they feel towards her. She fears not knowledge, but ignorance. At the same time, she cannot permit Catholics to participate in what is objectively a false form of worship by attending non-Catholic services. The whole point of the matter is this: the Catholic Church is the one true Church and the worship she pays to God is the worship willed by God; no group or sect separated from the Catholic Church is the true Church or any part of the true Church, and the worship performed by such groups or sects is not the worship willed by God. Hence the ruling of the Church regarding non-Catholic services.

There is another reservation we feel must be made regarding the religious aspect of the Springfield Plan as it has been worked out in practice according to the book we are discussing. Pp. 44-47 describe "The Festival of Lights" celebrated in one of the Springfield elementary schools. "As committees met to plan the school Christmas program three years ago," the authors write, "the point was made that nearly half the children would be left out, since it was not their holy day that was to be celebrated. In view of the fact that the Jewish Channukah also falls in December, the decision was made to combine the observance of the two religious festivals in one program having two parts symbolized by the two lights: Channukah, the candle, and Nativity, the star." In another book about the Springfield Plan (*The Springfield Plan. A Photographic Record.* By Alexander Alland and James Waterman Wise. New York: The Viking Press, 1945.) there is a photograph of children working on a large poster: "Festival of Lights" runs across the top, while the lower part of the poster is divided into two sections, with (printed in smaller letters) "Hanukkah the Candle," and "Nativity the Star," each occupying one side (p. 97).

Now, we do not for a moment doubt either the good faith or the good intentions of the adults and children who planned this pageant. We are sure that it was effectively and reverently performed by the children who took part in it. But surely it is impossible, on a little reflection, not to have grave doubts about the propriety of such a joint celebration. On Christmas we celebrate the Nativity of the Son of God. Can we really believe that Jesus Christ is divine, God Himself, and at the same time subordi-

nate the observance of His earthly birth-date under a general title "Festival of Lights" so as to make room for the observance, *on exactly equal terms*, of the story of Channukah? The October issue of *Common Sense*, commenting approvingly on this celebration, remarks: "The students see for themselves the resemblance between the Christian story of the child, and the Jewish tale of Hannah and her sons." The danger is that a Catholic child would be led to regard the two celebrations as equally important from a religious standpoint, as being on exactly the same religious level. Surely the respect and the love we owe to our fellow-citizens of the Jewish faith (and no Catholic following the teachings of the Church can be "anti-Semitic" to the slightest degree) do not demand a joint celebration of Christmas and Channukah—a celebration which might, in the eyes of Catholic children, rob the feast of Christmas of its *absolutely unique* importance in the history of God's Providence to men.

The fact that Professor Miller in his Introduction to *The Story of the Springfield Plan* has attributed to the Plan a basic religious philosophy with which no Catholic can agree, and the further fact that some of the practices connected with the operation of the plan seem objectionable from the Catholic point of view, by no means prove that Catholics cannot co-operate in a program aimed at the destruction of racial and religious bigotry. They do, however, indicate certain dangers against which Catholics everywhere must be on their guard when they are invited to participate in such a movement.

The remainder of this article is not concerned with the Springfield Plan in particular, but with some basic principles Catholics must bear in mind in connection with any program of this sort.

First of all, as a general principle, any worthy project for civic betterment and the promotion of truly democratic living (and a program of education directed towards the prevention of racial and religious tensions among citizens certainly falls in this category) is entitled to the support of Catholics not only as good citizens of the United States but also specifically as Catholics. Catholics as Catholics are certainly interested in racial and religious tolerance. From the early days when, in some sections of our country, death was the punishment for the celebration of Mass, down to our own times when the fanatical anti-Catholic lecturer and publicist capitalize upon ignorance regarding the

Catholic Church, Catholics have surely been the target of more vicious bigotry than has been hurled at any other group. If programs of democratic education could succeed in promoting a genuine knowledge among non-Catholics of what the Church really teaches, these programs would eliminate a good portion of the total sum of intolerance now existing in this country.

Catholics themselves must welcome any program tending to eliminate tensions and antagonisms among individuals of different racial stocks. The Catholic Church, as the very name denotes, is a universal Church, confined by no racial, national, or political boundaries. The Catholic Church is dedicated to the recognition of the dignity of the human person; she teaches the equal worth before God of all human souls, whether the bodies they inform be black, yellow, red, or white. The Catholic Church, and with her all her members, welcomes all races into the fold. No Catholic, living up to his Church's teachings could be guilty, for instance, of the narrow racial bigotry of an Emerson, whose contempt for the Boston Irish ("Paddys," he called them) almost equalled his provincial venom against Catholics and Catholicism. While Catholics need no civic programs to teach them respect for all races, they cannot but approve of and co-operate in such programs.

Regarding a decent respect (and more than that, a genuine love) for adherents of non-Catholic religions, Catholics are also guided and bound by the teachings of the Catholic Church. Their attitude is grounded in the second Great Commandment of the Law: "Thou shalt love they neighbor as thyself." Catholics are obliged in conscience to love all human beings without exception, whether they be Jews, Protestants, pagans, atheists, or infidels. Whatever their belief or lack of belief, all human beings must be loved with a supernatural love because they are all the possessors of immortal souls, made in the image and likeness of God. Unless the opposite is clear, Catholics presume that the adherents of other faiths are sincere in their beliefs, and Catholics respect the fact that these persons are presumably acting in accord with their consciences. Catholics do indeed hope and pray that such individuals will be given the grace of the true faith by God, but to display bigotry or hatred against them, or to join in with or sympathize in any movement directed against such persons, to harm them physically or in any other way, or to de-

stroy their property is impossible for any Catholic acting in accord with the tenets of his religion. As to the question of equal civil rights, Rev. Dr. Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R., expresses the Catholic attitude when he writes, in his pamphlet *Freedom of Worship*: "The Catholics of America are just as anxious as their Protestant and Jewish neighbors to maintain and to promote civil equality for all religions throughout our land" (p. 15). Once again, Catholics need no guidance other than that of the Church to teach them to love their neighbors of different religious beliefs, but there is no reason why they may not participate in movements to that end, and there is every reason why they should.

However, there is another principle to be observed by Catholics in connection with such programs, and it is not less important than the first. No Catholic can in conscience participate in a movement which, in theory or in practice, explicitly or implicitly, creates the impression that all religions are equally true and equally good, and that, denominational differences being unimportant, all churches are equally entitled to be regarded as the Church of God. Thus, no Catholic can subscribe, or appear by silence to assent, to a philosophy of religious indifferentism; if such a philosophy underlies any program in which he is asked to participate, he must beg to be excused.

The reason for this is simple. No Catholic can ever deny that the Catholic Church is the only true Church. This belief is a matter of faith. Moreover, it is supported by rational arguments, leading to a strictly logical conclusion. The fact that Jesus Christ was the Legate of God can be proved from history and reason. He taught a doctrine that He claimed was divine, a doctrine obligatory for all men, in all places and in all times. He proved His divine mission by means of miracles and prophecies, signs which could come only from God, and which attest the divine approval of the doctrine Christ taught and the claims He made for it. Jesus Christ really founded a Church. To this Church He entrusted the continuation of the divine mission that He had received from His Heavenly Father. He commanded His Church to preach His message to all men. He promised to be with it always in His teaching office and to protect it from error as long as the world should last. Between the Church as founded by Jesus Christ and the Catholic Church as it exists today there is a

strict and demonstrable historical continuity. The Catholic Church and the Catholic Church alone is the true Church of Jesus Christ and hence the only true Church of God.

This is the teaching of the Catholic Church and no Catholic is permitted to compromise it in the slightest degree by lending his name or his assistance to any movement that denies it either in theory or in act. The truth of the Catholic religion may not be subordinated to any program of civic betterment, no matter how lofty such a program may appear in some of its aspects. As every Catholic knows, this position of the Catholic Church has been bitterly denounced by non-Catholics as "arrogant," "intolerant," "undemocratic," and so forth. It is none of these. It is simply the recognition of a fact.

We should not be surprised, however, to find certain anti-Catholics of our day using this "exclusiveness" of the Catholic Church as a shibboleth against us. As John Henry Newman pointed out in his *Essay on Development*, the Church from the earliest centuries has been marked by the same exclusiveness, the same insistence that she, and she alone is, by right and in fact, the custodian of Christ's doctrine; and this exclusiveness even in Ante-Nicene times brought down upon the Church the epithets of "seducer, harlot, apostate, Antichrist, devil" (cf. pp. 268-73). The Church will always have enemies, and even their vocabulary has a curious sameness through the ages.

If attacks upon the Catholic Church have the habit of being essentially the same, there is, nevertheless, a peculiar twist that has been especially noticeable, we think, in the past few years. There exists a form of bigotry that is doubly insidious because of its specious basis in a plea for "tolerance." Anti-Catholic lecturers and journalists are particularly fond of an argument which, stripped of its verbiage, runs something like this: "Religious tolerance is a wonderful thing and all men must work for it; but the Catholic Church claims that she alone is the true Church of Jesus Christ, an obviously absurd and arrogant proposition, since it would make all other religions false; therefore let all men of good will unite in condemning the Catholic Church!" This is certainly "tolerance" with a difference—"tolerance" including everybody but Catholics. We are very much afraid that "tolerance" as well as liberty, can have crimes committed in her name.

Catholics must realize that every statement of the Catholic

position regarding true religious tolerance will be, on the part of some of those outside the Church, deliberately misrepresented, distorted, and abused. This we cannot help. We must make our stand clear. Co-operation for tolerance, co-operation in any civic movement, does not mean that we must accept false principles. If, because of our position, we ourselves are attacked and made the object of religious bigotry, the fault is not on our side, and we can bear such injustice with our heads high. For a Catholic, the Catholic religion and its teachings cannot be compromised, whatever the goal. If those to whom religion means little or nothing, who regard it merely as a convenient means to some secular end, or who have a distorted, watered-down idea of it, or who have merely inherited a hatred for the Catholic Church cannot understand our position, we are not responsible on their account. If we were to buy relief from bigotry at the expense of the teaching of the Church we would indeed be bartering our birthright for a sorry mess of pottage. There is a thing more important than our own personal comfort. That thing is the truth.

EDMOND DARVIL BENARD

The Catholic University of America,
Washington, D. C.

THE HOLINESS OF THE CHURCH

The distinctive doctrines of the Catholic Church, when rightly understood and properly appreciated, have a remarkable tendency to promote holiness among her members. Here we have an altar, as Christians had in the days of St. Paul; a daily sacrifice; churches always open to worshipers, and, in Catholic countries, constantly visited by worshipers at almost every hour of the day; we have churches decorated with all the ornaments of the fine arts, and filled with beautiful and appropriate symbols that raise the heart to heavenly things and to God; churches in which Christ is really present in the Holy Eucharist, and is always ready to receive the homage of His people, and to shower His choicest blessings on their heads; churches in which the Christian *feels* the presence of his God, and bends down in lowly reverence and awe before Him; churches in which the voice of silent prayer ever ascends, like incense, up to heaven; churches, in a word, to which that respect is shown which is due to the house of God, in which He delights to dwell in the midst of His children.

—Archbishop Martin J. Spalding, in *The Evidences of Catholicity* (Baltimore: John Murphy and Co., 1857), pp. 214 f.

THE PARISH PRIEST AND THE RETURNING SOLDIER

As I sit here sweating it out on this crowded transport, watching the chowline inch its way down the ladder, I can't help wondering how these young men are going to fit into the normal parish as I knew it just before the war. V-J day has come and gone. We are headed for a zone of occupation. We sincerely hope our time there will be short and that we will be permitted to return home soon.

No doubt many of the pastors and curates at home are almost as well acquainted with the G.I.'s as we priests in the service, but it has occurred to me that some parish priests who have not been in too intimate contact with service men might appreciate some hints on what to expect and what not to expect of returning servicemen.

First of all let me explain that my experience is rather limited, having spent some twenty months with one Marine Division. Secondly, I do not desire to arouse any controversy, but merely to offer some hints that may help pastors and curates to receive the returning serviceman as an active member in the parish.

A priest enters the service to offer Mass, to administer the sacraments, to counsel and instruct the men in his charge. The military has an entirely different slant on the chaplain's job. You have seen pictures in your Catholic papers of priests saying Mass in all manner of adverse conditions. No doubt you received the impression that the military was all out to co-operate with the Catholic chaplain. This is hardly true. Naturally you did not see pictures or write-ups of the times he wasn't allowed to say Mass or of the times men were prevented from attending Mass for trifling reasons. I mention this to assure you that our lot was not always as serene as one might imagine by reading some of the write-ups, and also to prevent you from overestimating the good we might have done.

Now let me mention some of the things in which adjustment will be necessary, and in which, consequently, tact will be required on the part of the parish priests.

(1) *Money*: The G.I. never heard money preached unless he heard it in a civilian church. He has been used to having things handed out to him. We have been urging him to *take* rosaries,

missals, prayerbooks, pamphlets, medals—contributed by the generosity of the folks back home.

There was never a first collection, much less a second, although some of us at times managed a simulated collection. This, however, was risky and could never be "talked up." Hence the G.I. will not be used to hearing, "There will be a second collection for the coal bill, or for a new roof on the school."

The G.I. scarcely knows what a Mass stipend is. I wouldn't need both hands to count on my fingers the number of Mass stipends I have received in the last twenty-four months.

The obligation of supporting the Church is a duty that will have to be taught *ab ovo*. How?

(2) *Converts*: Many converts will return half-instructed. Many will not have been confirmed. This is not necessarily our fault. Men were often transferred on short notice or they were transferred from an outfit with a Catholic chaplain to one without one. Many of the customs and devotional practices of those older in the Faith will be entirely new to the convert. These new members of the Faith especially need to be followed up.

(3) *Marriage*: Needless to say there are many phases that could be touched on in this question. I shall mention but two. I doubt if the pastors at home realize just how many marriages are at the breaking point. For so many of the men returning, the first few weeks will be critical ones. I think that some tactful advice by the pastor might well be able to save some of these marriages.

A great deal of patience will be necessary to revalidate marriages. Often in times of great danger we admitted men to the sacraments on their promise to have an invalid marriage revalidated mmediately on their return. Whether or not these promises will be as fresh in the minds of the men when they return safe and sound as they were when they were lying on a stretcher remains to be seen. Of course, not all of those who made such promises did so in the stress of battle. For all of them, however, tact and patience will be necessary on the part of the priest who contacts them.

(4) *Fast and Abstinence*: The law of the Church and the days on which it applies are pretty well forgotten, since the men in the service were obliged to fast and abstain on only four days of the year. The fact of Friday abstinence as well as the reasons for it will need stressing. This is particularly true of converts.

(5) *Liturgy*: The men are unfamiliar with the more solemn ceremonies of the Church. A High Mass was uncommon, a Solemn Mass most rare. The ritual for Holy Week could be carried through only in some of the larger bases. The Stations of the Cross too are unfamiliar to the men. So many of the little practices that are so much a part of the good Catholic's life are unknown to or have been forgotten by the men who have been in the service for a long time.

(6) *Reading*: Good Catholic reading will have to be made available and "sold" to the returning men. So very many are so very ignorant regarding their faith. They have done very little serious reading in the service. In fact the only author I am quite sure the Marines know by name is Thorne Smith, although Zane Grey and Ellery Queen would probably be recognized. For every one who read the *Sunday Visitor*, there were dozens who read *Esquire*.

(7) *Loss or Gain*: This next point is a touchy question. Remember I give it only as my opinion. Recently I read, in a Catholic magazine, I believe, a statement by a Catholic chaplain. I cannot quote it verbatim but the gist of it was this: "Many people are worried about the men in the service losing their religion. I haven't found this true. In fact many have found religion in the service." I think this statement at best is only partly true. It seems to me to be denying all that we have been preaching for so long—the good influence of a Catholic home, the tremendous force of good example from good Catholic parents or wife, the necessity of Catholic education. To take a young man out of a Catholic home with all that it implies and put him in a tent or office, the walls of which are plastered with suggestive pictures, to expose him constantly to filthy conversation, salacious literature, indecent pictures, and say he doesn't lose by it, puts quite a strain, in my mind, either on the grace of God or the definition of religion.

(8) *Holy Name Society*: Many men in the service belong to the Holy Name Society. How well they fulfilled their obligations depended a good deal on the vitality of the Society at the particular base in which they were located. I am certain the Society was a tremendous benefit to the men, but out here in the Pacific it was always a difficult task to keep it organized and on schedule. Too many things nterfered. I do believe, however, that this

organization offers one of the easiest and surest means of bringing the servicemen back into an active participation in parish life.

(9) *Contact*: One last thing. You will have to contact the servicemen. You must go to him. The military life has sapped his initiative. He will need to be lead for a time at least. I cannot insist too much on this point—he will not come to you, you will have to go to him. The military life has not taught or encouraged him to come to the priest.

There is important work ahead. There is great opportunity for a zealous priest. The vigor of the Catholic Church in the United States depends a good deal on how much or how little the returning servicemen participate in the Catholic life of the parish. The task will not be always easy, but the parish priest will have an abundance of good material to work with.

CHARLES F. SUVER

San Francisco, California.

FIFTY YEARS AGO

In the January, 1896, issue of *The American Ecclesiastical Review*, Fr. Conrad Eubel, O.M.C., of the Vatican Library Staff, writes on the subject of "The Secret Vatican Archives." His description of the abundant historical sources contained in this collection helps one to realize how great a benefit Pope Leo XIII conferred on historians when he determined, in 1879, to open the Vatican archives to scholars and investigators from all parts of the world. . . . Writing on the two different genealogies of Christ given in the New Testament, Fr. Joseph Tracy (at present pastor of St. Columbkille's Church, Brighton, Mass.) favors the view that St. Matthew proposes the *royal* (not the *legal*) line of Our Lord's descent, while St. Luke gives the actual blood connection—a theory which Fr. Tracy accredits to an English churchman, Lord Arthur Charles Hervey. . . . Abbé Hogan, S.S., continues his discussion of clerical studies, with an article on Homiletics. . . . Dr. Periès, of the Catholic University, explains the duties of the diocesan Auditor. . . . Fr. Siegfried, of Overbrook Seminary, severely criticizes a recent work, *Faith and Science*, by Mr. Henry Brownson, son of Orestes Brownson. . . . In reply to a correspondent's query it is stated that a Catholic who joins the Y. M. C. A. may not be absolved.

F. J. C.

GRIEVANCE

PART II

As the door opened just to the right of the table where they were sitting Father Arnold stood up, whispering to Faber to do the same. At the table on the other side of the room Father Wall and his attorneys, Fathers Brockheim and Brown also rose. Three priests clad in the red-trimmed black gowns of Doctors of Canon Law filed through the door and took their places behind the long desk on the dais at Faber's right. In front of the dais were two tables, at one of which stood the *Promotor Justitiae* and at the other the Notary with a stenotypist. The *Vice-officialis*, standing between the other two Doctors of Canon Law at the raised desk, so that he was just below the large crucifix[1] hanging against the red drape which covered the wall behind him, intoned the opening prayer.

When all were seated the *Vice-officialis* introduced the two priests seated beside him as "Synodal Judges," explaining that while this was not a case calling for three judges,[2] nevertheless he felt that because of the nature of the dispute and its novelty he was entitled to the counsel of others.[3] It was for this same reason, he said, that he was permitting both Father Wall and Faber, together with their attorneys, to be present at the hearing of the witnesses.[4] Should they, however, fail to observe proper respect and decorum in the court-room[5] or attempt to put any questions directly to the witnesses[6] they would be expelled immediately. Any questions which they might have to ask were to be handed to him in writing and he would put them to the witnesses.[7] He was counting on them to suggest from time to time points on which fuller information should be obtained so that everything could be cleared up as the case went along, thus obviating any necessity for calling any witness back for a rehearing. Should that be found necessary, the witness would be called back, of course,[8] but it would mean delay in the final disposition of the case.

After these opening remarks, the *Vice-officialis* called Faber to testify, directing him to come to the table at which the Notary

[1] Cf. Can. 1636.
[2] Cf. Can. 1576, §1.
[3] Cf. Can. 1575.
[4] Cf. Can. 1640, §1.
[5] Cf. Can. 1640, §2.
Cf. Can. 1773, §2.
[7] Cf. Can. 1773, §2.
[8] Cf. Can. 1781.

sat so that, placing his right hand on the Book of Gospels[9] which the Notary opened for him, he might take his oath to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help him God.[10]

As Faber went back to sit down in the chair placed midway between the table at which he had been sitting and the one at which Father Wall sat, he saw that the Notary was writing something on the pad before him. He was, of course, noting for the record that Faber had taken the oath.[11]

The chair in which Faber sat was comfortable enough, and the questions were put to him by the *Vice-officialis* in an easy tone of voice. As the hearing went on Faber began to lose his nervousness, finally realizing that with all the questions coming from the presiding judge there was no need to fear that some one might attempt to brow-beat him. The questions, too, were short, simple, and direct.[12]

The opening questions as to Faber's name, his parents' names, his age, religion, job, address, and position in the case,[13] did not seem to interest the *Promotor Justitiae*, who lounged in his chair behind his table which stood before the judge's bench and to the right of that of the Notary. When, however, Faber began to recite the details of his story the *Promotor Justitiae* sat up, leaned forward, and watched him keenly.

The stenotypist recorded the questions of the *Vice-officialis* and Faber's answers[14] while the Notary seemed to be watching everything which went on in the room, making notes from time to time on a pad before him.[15]

In answer to the questions put by the *Vice-officialis*, Faber explained that he had gone to work as janitor at St. Mary's because, though he was only thirty-nine years old at the time, he had been in the sanatorium for two years before that with a bad case of tuberculosis, and had had to have one lung collapsed, so that he had been forbidden to take a job in a factory or on a farm. He told for what wages he had agreed to work, explaining that by that time he had hardly felt that he was in a condition to bargain for anything. He had needed money and a place for his family to

[9] Cf. Can. 1636.
[10] Cf. Can. 1744.
[11] Cf. Can. 1779.
[12] Cf. Can. 1775.
[13] Cf. Can. 1774.
[14] Cf. Can. 1778.
[15] Cf. Can. 1773, §1; 1779.

stay, and if he had not got the job as janitor he would have had nothing at all.

He had tried to live within his income. His wife had learned to spend money wisely during the time when he was in the sanatorium and she took care of spending whatever he made. She did not waste money on foolish things, but bought only necessaries. As a result, they had, at first, been able to live within his income; but with prices going up since he started to work for the parish it had become increasingly difficult for him to make ends meet and he had finally been forced to borrow money, especially after the accident, which had used up the little which they had managed to put by in the very beginning of his employment, and this borrowed money he now found it almost impossible to pay back. He had never kept books of any kind, so he could not say exactly how much it had cost him to live, but he had tried to live within his income and had found that impossible.

That a house had been furnished to him, Faber admitted readily enough. He had been told when he took the job that the house belonged to the parish and that, since it was next to the church so that it would be convenient for him in his work, he could have the use of it without cost to him for rent. It was a nice house, he said, comfortable and neat, and he had felt proud to keep it looking nice.

The bills for gas and electricity were paid by the parish, as were the taxes on the place and the cost of materials for minor repairs. This was all in the original agreement. He was expected to make those minor repairs with the materials furnished to him, and this he was glad to do, since he liked to tinker around, and keep the place looking good. If he had had to take care of all these costs himself his salary would not have been anywhere near sufficient, but even with this worry off his mind, he had still not been able to take care of all his bills. Raising children was expensive, he said, no matter how careful a couple tried to be.

The *Promotor Justitiae* handed the *Vice-officialis* a slip of paper. The judge read it, nodded, and asked, "How many children have you?"

"Three, Father, I wish I had more, but I just can't afford it."

At this Father Wall jerked around in his seat and opened his mouth as if to speak, but Father Brockheim put his hand on his arm, the *Vice-officialis* and *Promotor Justitiae* looked sharply at

him, and he slumped back in his chair as the Notary hastily jotted on his pad, catching from the corner of his eye the faint smile that flickered an instant about the lips of Father Arnold.

Faber, kept busy by the next question of the *Vice-officialis*, said that he did not know whether the salary he had received plus the costs for rent, electricity, gas, coal, and repairs would add up to a "living wage" in the community.

Father Wall had also given Faber the use of his cottage at the lake for the last two weeks of the summer each year. Faber had been able to go there with his family and enjoy some fishing after he had got the school opened and ready for the new year. While he was away some of the older boys had taken care of the ordinary cleaning. They were the same boys who helped him during the year to work out their tuition. The understanding was that, having used the cottage for the two-week period, Faber was to put it into condition for the winter, boarding up the windows and shutting off the water, etc. This use of the cottage did not seem to be in the contract of hire as janitor, so far as he could see, because nothing was said of it during the first summer he had been at the parish. It was at the beginning of the following summer of 1941 that Father Wall had made the suggestion, and Faber had accepted gladly. He did not know whether to say that this was a free gift from the pastor, or not, because after all he had had to put the place in shape for the winter.

The injury which Faber had suffered occurred when a shipment of candles had arrived one Saturday. The express company had delivered the cases and finding the sacristy door locked, had deposited them outside, on the housekeeper's assurance that that would be all right. Faber had intended to get some one to help him move those heavy cases, but there was no one around when he came to ring the Angelus, and he had left the cases where they were. That evening after confessions Father Wall had ordered him to get the cases into the basement out of the weather, which was threatening by that time. There was still no one around to help, and he had tried to move the cases himself. It was while he was moving the second, and last, case that he had slipped on the stairs and wrenched his back.

It had cost him a hundred dollars for the doctor's bill, and it would have been more if the doctor had not felt that Faber was unable to pay much. The doctor had been very kind and had

wanted to continue treating him, but Faber felt that it was not fair to have the doctor do more for him when he could not pay. Furthermore, with the other doctors going into the service at that time the doctor himself was overworked and Faber had not wanted to impose on him. The doctor had told him that he really should go away to the hospital to be properly taken care of. That, however, he could not afford to do, for even though he could be cared for free of charge in the State hospital as a county case, still, he had to think of earning something to keep his family going. Besides, he did not relish the idea of being a charity patient. If he could not pay his way, he did not want to impose on people.

As for the damage to the property of the church, Faber admitted that the case of candles he was handling at the time of the injury had been smashed, cracking most of the candles inside. Later, when he was cleaning the church, the pain in his back, which had been striking him from time to time, had caught him, and he had dropped or knocked over some rather expensive vases, but he did not think that they were worth as much as they said in the counter-claim. Father Wall had been angry with him when he reported the damage, but he had not insisted then that Faber should pay for them.

Again the *Promotor Justitiae* handed a note to the *Vice-officialis*, who asked when the damage to these things had occurred. Faber said that it had been in the spring of 1943.

The *Vice-officialis*, setting aside the paper from which he had been reading the questions proposed by Faber's attorney,[16] took up another paper on which were the questions suggested by Fathers Brockheim and Brown.

Faber admitted that when he came to look for work he had told the pastor he would work for any price because he needed the job so badly. He had also agreed that the salary and the use of the house, without cost to him for rent, repairs, electricity, and gas, coal, or taxes, would be quite adequate for himself and his family.

He had not really asked to go to the cottage to stay. All he had asked was whether Father Wall would mind if he used his boat for a day's fishing now and then when the Father was not

[16] Cf. Can. 1745.

using it. It was Father Wall who had suggested that Faber stay in the cottage and close it up for him.

There had been no one working with him at the time of the injury. The boxes were really too heavy for him to move alone, and he had intended to leave them where they were until he could get some one to help him move them. The pastor, however, had insisted that they be moved before the storm came up, and he had tried to do as the pastor had said even though he knew they were too heavy for him.

Faber admitted further that it would be incorrect to say that he had been forced by any one to work for the salary which he accepted. It was just that he had not been able to find any other work which he could do and he had really needed the job so as to have something to live on. He supposed he would have to say that he had freely agreed to work for the salary paid him, because after all it had been up to him whether he would take the job at that salary or not, and he had needed the job so badly. He was not tricked in any way into agreeing to work for that sum, certainly not. It was all open and above board. It was a case of take it or leave it.

As they knew already, he had paid no rent for the house which he had occupied. Of course, it would have cost him something for rent had he had to live anywhere else in town. He had not paid the taxes on the place, either, for they were paid by the parish. He had made some minor repairs around the place to keep it in good shape, as he had agreed to do, but the materials had been charged to the parish, that he knew, because the man who delivered them had taken the bill over to the parish-house.

He had not been required to pay for the electricity or gas. That, after all, was the understanding, that these bills would be paid for him. The coal had come when the deliveries were made for the church, school, and parish-house, and no bills for coal were ever presented to him. He or his wife had signed the receipts to show delivery, but that was all. He did not know how much all these bills would amount to, but they would certainly have been more than he could have met had he had to pay them out of the salary which he received.

The Notary observed that Father Arnold, who had been rather tense while Faber answered the questions prepared by Fathers Brockheim and Brown, now seemed as uncertain as they, seeing

the *Vice-officialis* take up another paper. This was a list of questions proposed by the *Promotor Justitiae.*

Faber, hesitating slightly in his response, said that he supposed the money for his salary came out of the funds contributed by the members of the parish. There was no other way for the pastor to get the money to pay the bills, so far as he knew. He did not know whether the people of the parish could have contributed more, thus allowing more salary to be paid to him. He guessed that, after all, the amount of money which Father Wall had to spend did depend on what the people contributed. If they did not contribute there would not be money to pay any of the bills or the janitor's salary, either. He did not know what sort of income the people of the parish had, but they were not, any of them, very wealthy. They were either storekeepers or farmers or retired farmers living in town.

He felt no inclination, he said, to apologize for the fact that he was a janitor at the church. After all, it was a respectable job, more respectable than some others he knew of. He had his work to do, and he did it, and he rather liked the work. It was nice to be around the church and keep the place looking neat and clean. It had been harder to do this since his back had been bothering him, but he still liked to keep things looking nice. As far as he knew the people of the parish were satisfied with the way he kept the church and school and the grounds looking. They had told him sometimes that things had never looked so nice. Father Wall was not the one to pass out compliments, but he had never found much fault with the way Faber did his work, so he guessed the pastor was satisfied. It would have helped to know that the pastor liked it, but he was not the type to say so, even if he felt it, Faber guessed.

Father Wall seemed surprised to hear the janitor say this, noted the Notary on his much-used pad.

The job was not too hard, continued Faber, except for times like the one when he had hurt himself trying to move those cases of candles, and there was a certain satisfaction in that it was steady. He was not very liable to be laid off, and that was something. He could probably go on working there so long as he was able to get around, unless, of course, this present situation should result in his being fired. The people were friendly, too, for the most part, and since he had been working at the church he had got ac-

quainted with most of the people in town, so that he was no longer a stranger but could greet most of them on the street and visit with them.

He did all the firing in the church, school, and rectory, but when it came to sweeping the boys helped him in the school, to work out their tuition, and the ladies of the Altar Society helped in the cleaning of the church. The housekeeper, of course, took care of the cleaning in the house.

Faber did not know what the usual rate of pay would be for the type of work done by him. So far as he knew the salary of the janitor was set by the pastor of the parish. He had not heard any of the people of the parish express the opinion that he was underpaid, in fact, the matter of how much he was paid had not been discussed by them with him. So far as he knew, too, they were satisfied with the way in which he had been doing his work. As he had said, some had spoken to him to say that they liked the way the church and school were kept up since he had come, and he had heard no real complaints.

While Faber was telling his story the stenotypist, who from the beginning had been recording every word, was replaced by another. The roll of paper containing the notes of the first operator was taken from the machine and initialed by the Notary to authenticate it. As the second operator continued the record, the first left the room, returning after a time with the original roll and some typewritten pages which the Notary placed on the table in front of him. The second operator, taking the second roll, similarly authenticated by the Notary, left as the one who had just returned slipped into place and kept the machine going. The second operator, too, returned after a time with the second roll of notes and the typewritten pages for the Notary, and at the end of Faber's testimony the original operator went out to transscribe the last part of the notes taken.

At the end of Faber's testimony the *Vice-officialis* announced that the questions asked and the answers given by the janitor would be read back to him so that he might know just how his statements stood for the record. He was further informed that if, as the reading progressed, he wanted to make any changes in the wording of his answers, or to strike out anything on the record, or

correct any statement attributed to him, or add anything to what had been taken down he could do so.[17]

While the Notary was reading from the typewritten pages in front of him, each of which he had numbered, initialed, and sealed with the seal of the court to authenticate it,[18] the stenotypist who had taken the last part of the testimony returned with the final pages typewritten in time for them to be read without delay. When the reading was finished and the changes had been made to the satisfaction of Faber, his attorney, and Father Wall and his attorneys,[19] Faber rose and went as directed to the Notary's table where he signed the last page of the transcript of his testimony. The Notary then handed the page up to the *Vice-officialis* who also signed it, and then the Notary himself signed it to make the authentication complete.[20]

It was now Father Wall's turn to testify. As Faber went to sit beside his attorney, the pastor rose and went to stand in front of the Notary to take his oath. Placing his right hand upon his breast he called upon God to witness the truth of the answers which he was about to give[21] and then sat down in the witness chair.

The pastor told how, one day, when he was in need of a janitor, he had considered himself fortunate in that Faber had come along looking for work. The man had looked pretty much down and out at the time, so to do something for him, Father Wall had offered him the job. The man had agreed willingly enough to work for the salary Father Wall offered.

Father Arnold passed a note up to the *Vice-officialis*, who read it, and asked, "How did it happen that you were in need of a janitor at that time?"

"The janitor I had quit the day before."

"Why did he quit?"

"He went off to the neighboring city to get a job."

"Why was he not satisfied with the job he had as janitor?"

"Well, he wanted a raise and I could not give it to him."

The salary, said Father Wall, which he had offered Faber was the same as that which he had paid the janitor who left. In fact, it was the same salary which he had always paid all the janitors

[17] Cf. Can. 1780, §1.
[18] Cf. Can. 1643.
[19] Cf. Can. 1783, 2°.
[20] Cf. Can. 1780, §2.
[21] Cf. Can. 1622, §1.

whom he had had before, all during the time that he had been pastor at St. Mary's.

"How long have you been pastor at St. Mary's?"

"I went there in 1931."

"How many janitors have you had in that time?"

"Well, the first one, the one who was there when I came, stayed until 1935. Since then I have had one, two—three, counting Faber, here."

"Then that means that they stay with you about three years, on the average?"

"Yes."

"Why did the others leave?"

"They wanted more money and I could not afford to give it to them, so they went elsewhere to get a job."

Father Wall's statements about the use of the house and the payment of the bills for gas, electricity, coal, repairs and taxes substantially agreed with Faber's previous testimony.

The pastor was no more certain than Faber had been as to what would be considered a "living wage" in the community, but he was certain that Faber had "had enough to live on." He did not know about any curtailment of the Faber family due to the small size of the janitor's income, and was inclined to feel that it would have been quite sufficient for an increase in the family. He had not thought much about the size of the family, as a matter of fact, or if he had, he had recalled the years Faber had spent in the hospital and had dismissed the question from his mind.

He had permitted the janitor to use the cottage because he found, after Faber had been with him for a time, that the janitor liked to fish; he liked the man and his family, so he thought it would be a nice gesture to let him use the cottage for a time when the boys were around to take care of things. After all, a man ought to have a vacation away from his job, and so he had given Faber one.

Asked why he now wanted to consider the use of the cottage as a part of Faber's income, he replied that it would certainly have cost Faber money had he wished to rent a cottage for himself and family, and so, if he was going to claim that he had been underpaid, he should consider that the use of the cottage was compensation over and above the amount for which he had agreed to work.

The *Promotor Justitiae* passed a note up to the *Vice-officialis* who read it, nodded, and asked, "Who owns the cottage?"

"I do," answered Father Wall.

"Do you mean it is your personal property?"

"Yes."

"Then the cottage does not belong to the parish?"

"No."

"Then you are the one who benefited by the fact that Faber put the place in order for the winter?"

"Yes."

It would, of course, have cost the pastor money to hire some one to put the place in order for the winter had he not wished to do the work himself, and had he not had Faber to do it for him. Personally, then, he admitted, he had benefited pecuniarily by having Faber take his vacation at the cottage, but he protested that, after all, it did amount to a vacation for Faber and had not cost the janitor anything. Of course, it had cost him something in the form of the incidental work of putting the place in order for the winter, but that would be far outweighed by the benefit Faber received. The parish, it was true, had not benefited by Faber's use of and work around the cottage.

As to Faber's injury, the pastor recalled that the weather had been threatening that evening when he ordered the man to move the cases of candles down into the basement of the church where they would be out of harm's way. He had not thought that the cases would be too heavy for him. He had heard the crash when the second case smashed on the basement floor, and he had come out to see what had happened. Faber was lying on the floor and the pastor had helped him up and put him in his car and taken him to the doctor. He had had to go down town to pick up his Sunday paper then, and when he finally had got back to the doctor's office after meeting people, who kept him talking on the street, Faber was gone. The doctor had said that the injury might be serious, but Faber had been on the job after that and had not complained particularly, so Father Wall, busy with other things, had not paid much attention to the matter. He was quite surprised now to find that the janitor claimed so much damages when he had been able to get around and do his work afterward, except for the things which he had broken, of course.

The pastor enumerated again for the record the list of damaged articles which had been appended to the counter-claim.

When Father Wall had finished answering the questions addressed to him the typewritten transcript was read back to him as it had been to Faber. When it was in proper form with all necessary corrections made, it, too, was signed by Father Wall, the *Vice-officialis*, and the Notary.

The *Vice-officialis* was about to adjourn the session of the tribunal for the day when the *Promotor Justitiae* handed him another note. The judge read it, frowned, and showed it to the two Synodal Judges sitting beside him. There was a hush in the courtroom as the three men on the bench paged through their copies of the Code of Canon Law, and then consulted in low tones, while the parties and their attorneys sat watching this new development.

Finally, the *Vice-officialis*, clearing his throat, said, "The *Promotor Justitiae* has brought it to the attention of this Tribunal that a prejudicial question has been raised which must be settled as soon as possible.[22] This question is: Whether it is proved that the parish of St. Mary could not pay its janitor more salary? This is the type of question for which documents offer the best proof.[23] It is, therefore, the decree of this Tribunal that the documents relating to the financial condition of the said parish, that is to say, the financial records thereof, being the books themselves and the published reports given out to the parishioners, for the period from August 1, 1940, to August 1, 1945, are to be presented to the court at the opening of the session tomorrow morning. The Notary will draw up a decree to that effect."

There was a moment of stunned silence. Father Arnold smiled, the Notary observed, and then grew serious, as if wondering how the records would affect his case. Father Wall started to protest, purpling, but Father Brown restrained him, while Father Brockheim wrote hurriedly and then passed his note up to the *Vice-officialis*.

After reading this note and showing it to the two Synodal Judges, the *Vice-officialis* announced, "I have here an objection from the defendant raised against the decree requiring the pre-

[22] Cf. Can. 1632. [23] Cf. Can. 1812.

sentation of the financial records and reports of the parish. Since I fail to see how such presentation can cause damage such as is mentioned in Canon 1755, §2, 2°, or a violation of a secret which must be kept, I cannot admit the objection, and the decree must stand. An exception, of course, can be taken on appeal. I might also observe that failure to produce these records and reports in their entirety can well be interpreted, according to Canon 1824, as an admission that receipts for the period were sufficiently in excess of expenditures to have permitted the pastor to pay Faber the higher salary for which he contends."

Father Wall and his attorneys, hearing this, indicated that the records would be produced at the opening of the morrow's session. Thereupon the *Vice-officialis* pronounced the day's session adjourned, said the closing prayer, and as all those present stood up, strode from the room followed by the two Synodal Judges.

(*to be continued.*)

THOMAS OWEN MARTIN.

The Catholic University of America,
Washington, D. C.

MISSION INTENTION

"Peace in the Orient" is the Mission Intention for the month of January, 1946.

THE DIGNITY OF THE PRIESTHOOD

It is to priests that spiritual birth and regeneration by baptism is entrusted. By them we put on Christ, and are united to the Son of God, and become members of that blessed head. Hence we should regard them as more august than princes and kings, and more venerable than parents. For the latter begot us of blood and the will of the flesh, but priests are the cause of our generation from God, of our spiritual regeneration, of our true freedom and sonship according to grace.

—St. John Chrysostom, *On the Priesthood* (Westminster, Md.: The Newman Bookshop, 1943), p. 44.

PEACE IN UNITY

While a great part of mankind looks to its statesmen to devise ways and means by which the diversified and in some instances anti-Christian theories of government of the Allied Nations might be amalgamated and directed towards outlawing future wars, Catholics see in the divinely established unity of the Church the only road by which the concerted action of the true followers of Christ can lead the world to a lasting peace. We possess today a prayer movement for Church Unity, the purpose of which is to gather into the one true Church all those who have unfortunately withdrawn from the Catholic religion and to unite them against the prevailing forces of Liberalism and Materialism. For, as His Holiness Pope Benedict XV remarked in an Apostolic Brief dated Feb. 25, 1916, "in the Unity of Faith the foremost characteristic of the Truth shines forth, and it is thus that the Apostle Paul exhorts the Ephesians to preserve the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace, by proclaiming that 'there is one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism.'" Noting the approval extended to this Octave of Prayer by the Catholic Hierarchy, he asserted that "with a glad heart, therefore, we have heard from the Society which is called 'of the Atonement,' established in New York, that prayers have been proposed to be recited from the Feast of the Chair of Blessed Peter at Rome to the Feast of the Conversion of St. Paul, in order that this aim of Unity might be obtained from the Lord and at the same time we rejoice that these prayers, blessed by Pope Pius the Tenth, of recent memory, and approved by the Bishops of America, have been circulated far and wide through the United States."

At no time in the past nineteen hundred years has the pendulum of history registered such terrible spiritual, moral, and material catastrophe as has befallen mankind in this tragic moment. For as the old world lies in fragments, the future of Christian civilization in Europe and the rest of the world hangs in the balance. Even the joy of hard-won victory, accompanied by the dawning hope of a new day of peace and reconstruction, cannot offset the knowledge that the progress of the human race in the present confusion of ideologies has been a progress without God and even against God; without Christ and even against

Christ. If mankind had but listened to the Church, there is little doubt that the chaos of this age, resulting from a weakening of faith in God and in Jesus Christ, and the darkening in men's minds of the light of moral principles, could have been avoided.

Our generation is reaping the woeful consequences of an incredulity which has succeeded in excluding Christ from modern life, especially from public life. The deep spiritual crisis that has overthrown the sound principles of private and public morality is the result of cleavage from the Church in the course of centuries and the divorcing of civil power from every kind of dependence on a Supreme Being. Cut off from the age-old teaching authority of the Catholic Church, many of the separated brethren have gone so far as to overthrow the central dogma of Christianity, the Divinity of the Saviour, and have hastened thereby the advance of spiritual and moral decay.

Now, in this hour of perhaps irrevocable decisions, the Church may well be envisioned as the voice of one crying in the wilderness, appealing to her wandering children to be united with her in the unity of faith and worship, so that their return to the Christian way of life might be a bulwark against the menace of modern pagan teaching. She alone, in the words of St. Augustine, "is the holy Church, the one Church, the true Church, the Church which strives against all heresies."[1] She alone fully recognizes the widespread atheistic and anti-Christian tendency rampant in the world, threatening to destroy all the ancient Christian institutions, the life of which consists in a supernatural principle, and to erect on their ruins and with their remains an illusory millennium of universal happiness, a new order which would rest on the quicksands of changeable and ephemeral standards contingent upon the selfish interests of groups and individuals.

Already, through the mysterious workings of divine Providence, this invitation extended by the Church has received long-awaited welcome from many who now perceive the inability of all human efforts to replace the laws of God and the unifying and elevating influence of Christ's love. But this is not enough. For, however much this hour of disillusionment has become an hour of grace, "a passage of the Lord" for some, sincere Catholics must humbly recognize their grave responsibility to work and pray that the tireless and salutary occupation of the Church in the spiritual

[1] *Serm. de Symbolo*, c. 6 (*PL*, 40, 635).

and religious re-education of mankind might bear fruit in the re-establishment of the Christian heritage over the whole world. On the minds of all those who seek refuge from the vortex of error and anti-Christian movements they should impress the words Our Holy Father addressed to the College of Cardinals on June 2, 1944. "How much more potent and efficacious would be the influence of Christian thought and Christian life on the moral sub-structure of the future plans for peace and social reconstruction, if there were not this vast division and dispersal of religious confessions, that in the course of time have detached themselves from Mother Church! Who, today, can fail to recognize what substance of faith, what a genuine power of resistance to anti-religious influence is lost in so many groups as a result of separation."

As never before, the collaboration of the laity in the Apostolate of the Hierarchy must have as its central theme Christ resplendent in His Divine Kingship, if He is to "grant the gifts of peace and unity to all nations."[2] For "in the recognition of the royal prerogatives of Christ and in the return of individuals and of society to the law of His truth and of His love lies the only way of salvation."[3] If Christian thought is to succeed in maintaining and supporting the work of restoration in individual, social and international life, then all who are working for a plan that does not conflict with the religious and moral content of Christian civilization must acknowledge that the Church which Christ founded on earth is the infallible spokesman on faith and morals for the whole world. For the Catholic Church alone possesses, in her infallible pronouncements, the fullness of the principles of Christian morality in all its ramifications. Because of the special assistance of the Holy Spirit promised to the Apostles and their successors, the episcopate united to the Roman Pontiff, she alone teaches men to observe all things whatsoever Christ has commanded. Further, only the Church possesses, from her very institution, a visible unity in doctrine, government and worship. Therefore, only she can establish an organic unity of all men—a supernatural union based on an all-embracing love deeply felt and practiced, rather than a unity which is exclusively human, external, superficial, and by that very fact, weak.

[2] *Secret*: Mass of Christ the King.

[3] Pope Pius XII, *Summi Pontificatus* (New York: The America Press, 1939), p. 7.

One of the most efficacious means for assuring a just and lasting peace is a Catholic Unity of all those who, seeking brotherly communion in Christ, humbly submit themselves and obey the Vicar of Christ as teacher and ruler of the Church. That is the end of the Prayer Octave for Church Unity founded by Father Paul James Francis, S.A., in 1908. It seeks to restore to God the honor denied Him for so many centuries and to acquire for men the fullness of the Christian heritage which alone can determine the most firm foundation of true peace, that interior peace which cannot be found except by coming close to the spiritual light of Bethlehem's cave.

Catholics especially must unite with Christ who prayed to His Heavenly Father "that they all may be one, even as thou, Father, in me and I in thee; that they also may be one in us, that the world may believe that thou has sent me."[4] And it is incumbent on them to make known the observance of this Octave to all others who sincerely seek eternal salvation, the promotion of the temporal welfare of peoples, their true prosperity, order, and tranquillity. During this Church Unity Octave, from Jan. 18 to Jan. 25, all should pray especially that God the Father may send His Holy Spirit to direct and guide statesmen, that He might inspire their thoughts, their feelings and deliberations, making them spiritually and materially vigorous and firm against obstacles, mistrust, and peril, so that as a result of their deliberations, a new order under the patronage of Christ the King may be established which will lead many wanderers back to the Unity of supernatural faith and love as found in His Mystical Body. For, says St. Ambrose, "great is the glory of justice; for she, existing rather for the good of others than of self, is an aid to the bond of union and fellowship amongst us. She holds so high a place that she has all things laid under her authority . . . but the Church, as it were, is the outward form of Justice, she is the common right of all. For all in common she prays, for all in common she works, in the temptation of all she is tried . . . For this reason, Paul has made Christ to be foundation, so that we may build upon Him the works of Justice."[5]

GREGORY FIGUEROA, S.A.

Atonement Seminary,
Washington, D. C.

[4] *John* 17: 21.

[5] *De Officiis Ministrorum*, 1, 136, 142.

PRESERVING THE FAITH INVIOLATE

It was a fundamental tenet of Martin Luther's teaching that man is justified by faith alone—faith in the sense of a deep conviction that one has found favor with God to the extent of having his sins covered over by the merits of the Redeemer. Among some evangelical sects this idea still persists and finds expression in the distinctively Protestant phenomenon of "conversion," such as frequently takes place at a "revival." Roused to a pitch of feverish excitement, the sinner "gets religion" through an overwhelming feeling that he is saved, and by virtue of this emotional conviction he is considered as being justified.

Against this doctrine the Catholic Church has constantly protested that faith alone is not sufficient for justification and salvation, whether faith be understood as the virtue whereby we believe divine revelation or as a firm conviction of enjoying God's favor.[1] In taking this stand, the Church is merely upholding the doctrine proclaimed by Christ when He declared: "Not everyone who says to me, 'Lord, Lord,' shall enter the kingdom of heaven but he who does the will of my Father in heaven shall enter the kingdom of heaven,"[2] and by St. James when he stated: "Faith without works is useless . . . . Faith without works is dead."[3] However firmly a person may believe and hope, he must also perform good works according to the dictate of his conscience, if he would be saved. Only a living faith, a faith productive of good works, will avail a man unto justification and salvation.

This is indeed a basic Christian principle, which the Catholic Church has ever emphasized in her teachings, and especially since the time of the Reformation. But, as in the case of any doctrine that is constantly stressed, there is danger that the importance of another doctrine may be overlooked. In their eagerness to defend the truth that faith alone cannot justify, Catholics may underrate the value of faith in itself. In emphasizing the necessity of good deeds, they are liable to favor the notion that what a person believes is of little account, as long as he does what is right. In present-day America we must be on our guard against this notion because many of our non-Catholic neighbors, nearer now to Pelagianism than to fundamental Protestantism, are

[1] *DB*, 800 ff. [2] *Matt.* 7:21. [3] *James* 1:20, 26.

assuring us that deeds, not creeds, are the all-important thing, that a person is free to accept any form of belief he may choose, as long as he conscientiously performs his duties toward his fellow-men, etc. No intelligent Catholic—particularly no Catholic priest—would give assent to such principles in their unqualified form. Yet, there is real danger that Catholics may compromise in a greater or less degree with such tenets, so that their words and conduct are notably affected. Naturally, the laity, unable to perceive the fine points of theology and to make exact distinctions, are more likely to fail in this respect than are the clergy; but it must be admitted regretfully that in recent times some priests have made use of expressions or performed actions quite conformable with the spirit of indifferentism that is gradually spreading throughout our land.

Now, it takes but little thought to realize the supreme importance of upholding and defending the Catholic faith in its unblemished integrity and of not yielding a single inch to the idea that a person is free to believe what he wishes. The doctrines proposed by the Catholic Church as truths of divine faith constitute the message of God to mankind. Every word bears the guarantee of divine wisdom and divine veracity. All men are obliged, under penalty of eternal damnation, to accept all these truths without restriction or equivocation. It is not permissible to distinguish between what is essential and what is accidental in the sense that, while holding some revealed doctrines, one may reject others without gravely violating the virtue of faith. All are immeasurably important because all rest on the authority of God revealing, who can neither be deceived nor deceive.[4] In a word, the deposit of faith is an indivisible whole; if one truth is deliberately denied, all are virtually denied. Inculpable ignorance will excuse a person from the guilt of formal transgression; nevertheless, it is objectively a mortal sin to deny or to doubt any truth of divine revelation, even though it may seem to be a purely speculative point, having no direct bearing on human conduct. The fierce conflicts that raged in the early Church on the abstruse questions of Trinitarian and Christological dogmas are ridiculed by the "modern" historian as inane hair-splitting; but that is not the genuine Catholic attitude. To discover the full content of the

[4] *DB* 1789

divine message is worth any amount of study and discussion. Undoubtedly, those who hotly debated the respective merits of the terms ὁμοούσιος and ὁμοιούσιος, whether on the orthodox or the heterodox side, had a far deeper appreciation of the sovereign value of divine truth than is possessed by the indifferentist of our day who smilingly asserts that it is quite unimportant whether we accept the divinity of Christ or not, so long as we keep the Golden Rule.

The grave obligation of preserving the purity of the faith incumbent on all who have any part in transmitting it to others is evidenced by the long list of those who are bound by the ecclesiastical law to pronounce the profession of faith on their entrance into office—the cleric before the reception of major orders, the bishop before consecration, the professor of theology, canon law, or philosophy at the beginning of each scholastic year or at least when he assumes his task, etc. So solicitous is the Church to impress on her clergy the gravity of their duty to keep the word of God undefiled that she commands a repetition of the profession of faith even when one passes to another office or benefice or dignity of the same species.[5]

It is the purpose of this article to point out, for the benefit of the clergy, some of the means required at the present day to preserve the Catholic faith in its full strength and perfect purity, and also to voice a warning against certain dangers to this divine virtue that are common in modern American life. These points will be considered under a twofold aspect—first, as they affect the priest's own teaching and ministerial activities; second, as they affect the laity under the priest's pastoral care.

I.

In writing or speaking on matters of doctrine, priests should make every effort to be scrupulously exact both in what they state and in the way in which they state it. Even presupposing a good seminary course in theology, a priest can easily give expression to erroneous or even heretical doctrine, if he does not carefully study the subject beforehand. For example, if a priest is not exact in his choice of terms, he is likely to say that Christ "did penance for our sins," not realizing that he should have said

[5] Canon 1406.

"satisfied for our sins," since penance in the strict sense can be practised only by one who has personal sins.[6] Again, it is sometimes stated that without charity one cannot perform a supernatural act. Taken literally, this statement is contrary to the teaching of the Council of Trent.[7] Perhaps what is meant is that no work meritorious of eternal life can be performed by one deprived of charity—which is perfectly correct, but does not justify the use of incorrect theological terms.

Priests should be careful also not to propose as a truth of faith what is in reality only a probable or commonly accepted theological conclusion. For example, to assert that the Catholic Church teaches that everyone has a special guardian angel is erroneous. The Church teaches that human beings are guarded by angels, but the notion of a special angel for each and every individual is only a commonly accepted theological opinion.[8] Again, to proclaim as a Catholic doctrine that the souls in purgatory pray for the living is to put the authorization of the Church on a view that is, indeed, upheld by some good theologians, but is rejected by others, including St. Thomas.[9]

In expounding Catholic teaching about the Church the priest must be especially careful, for many modern errors are relevant to this doctrine. In the first place, he must state clearly that the visible Church—the external, hierarchical organization with the Pope as its head—has been established by Christ as a necessary means of salvation. In other words, a person must belong in some way to the Catholic Church in order to be saved. Those who are outside the Church through no fault of their own, and who serve God as their conscience dictates can attain to salvation, but only if they are affiliated by implicit desire with the visible Church. It was the holy Roman, Catholic and Apostolic Church of which the Fourth Lateran Council asserted: "We believe that outside of it no one is saved."[10]

The explanation of this doctrine as it is sometimes proposed nowadays—that all those who are in the state of grace belong to

[6] Cf. Pruemmer, *Manuale Theologiae Moralis* (Fribourg Brisg., 1936), III, n. 310.

[7] *DB*, 798, 1399 ff.

[8] Cf. Hervé, *Manuale Theologiae Dogmaticae* (Paris, 1935), II, n. 318.

[9] Cf. Fenton, "Help From the Holy Souls," *The American Ecclesiastical Review*, XCV, 5 (Nov., 1936), 447 ff.

[10] *DB*, 423.

the soul of the Church, even though they do not belong to its body—is unfortunate, even though it is found in the revised Baltimore Catechism.[11] The distinction of the soul and body in this sense bears a resemblance to the Lutheran doctrine of an invisible Church, and is certainly an inaccurate mode of expressing the way in which non-Catholics can be justified and saved. In the words of the famed Fr. Hugh Pope, O.P.: "People often say that though a certain person does not belong to the body of the Church, he yet belongs to its soul. The very expression is so consoling that we are apt to welcome it without reflection. In truth the expression is a most misleading one . . . . It is not true that those outside belong to the soul of the Church, though they do belong to Him who is the soul of the Church."[12] Furthermore, to say that sanctifying grace as possessed by non-Catholics is the soul of the Church is irreconcilable with the teaching of Pope Pius XII in the Encyclical *Mystici Corporis* that the soul of the Church is the Holy Ghost, dwelling within the Church as its vivifying principle.[13] And, in this connection it is well to remark that from this same papal document we perceive the error of those who designate non-Catholics in the state of grace as members of the Mystical Body. The Pope tells us quite clearly that the Mystical Body is the visible, militant church.[14]

We hear much nowadays about "the right of everyone to practise whatever religion he pleases." Catholics, particularly priests, must shun this expression. We may say that *according to the laws of our land* everyone in the United States has the right to practise any religion he wishes. And we may add quite sincerely that Catholics regard this as the most feasible and most practical system for our country. Furthermore, one who accepts a false religion in good faith has a purely subjective right to practise it. But to assert without qualification that everyone has the right to practise whatever form of religion he chooses is to make a statement that is utterly illogical and irreverent. For no one can have a real objective right to practise any but the true religion, and Catholics believe that Catholicism is the only true religion, which

[11] Q. 168.

[12] *The Church: Cambridge Summer School of Catholic Studies*, ed. Lattey (Herder, 1928), 86.

[13] *AAS*, XXXV (1943), 220.

[14] *Ibid.*, 202, 223.

God commands all men to accept. Every other religion is false, and opposed to God's plan for man's salvation, and it is an egregious error to say that anyone has the right to accept it. This is the belief of Catholics, the belief for which millions have been persecuted and martyred. It ill behooves any Catholic of our day, particularly any Catholic priest, to compromise or to equivocate in propounding this doctrine through fear of offending those not of the Catholic faith.

It seems incredible, yet the statement has appeared in a Catholic publication that we are not striving to make America a Catholic country. Of course, we are trying to make America Catholic—not by coercion or high-power salesmanship or by false claims, but by the presentation of the logical grounds of Catholicism, by prayer and by good example. At the same time we need not hesitate to state that if we ever gained the balance of power in the United States we would not discriminate against non-Catholics, for even in that event perfect religious equality would remain the most practical policy.

It is deplorable when a Catholic priest shows himself so anxious to tell non-Catholics they are on the way to salvation if they follow the dictates of their conscience that he neglects to urge them to study the claims of the Catholic Church. I wonder how many priests in the United States today would have the courage to assemble a group of non-Catholic friends and tell them that they should look to withdrawing from that state in which they cannot be sure of their salvation. Yet, that is the admonition which Pope Pius XII delivered to the non-Catholics of the world.[15]

Some priests are inclined to be apologetic when they are questioned about the attitude of the Church in distinctively Catholic lands, such as the South American countries that are loath to admit Protestant missionaries. To explain such occurrences by the statement that the people of these lands are not yet educated to our ideas of democracy, that in the course of time they will come to realize that the American system of equality for all religions is the best, etc., does not touch the main point. We believe that the rulers of a Catholic country have the right to restrict the activities of those who would lead their people away

[15] *Ibid.*, 243.

from their allegiance to the Catholic Church. Perhaps it might be more practical and productive of less harm if the governments of Catholic countries granted full liberty to non-Catholic missionaries; but that does not weaken the principle that they possess the right to prevent propaganda against the Church. This is merely a logical conclusion from the basic Catholic tenet that the Son of God established one religion and commanded all men to accept it under pain of eternal damnation. If the true faith is so precious and the loss of the faith is so terrible a tragedy, why should not a government allied to the Church take measures to protect the faith of its people?

The Catholic Church claims the right to legislate for all baptized persons, whether they be Catholics or non-Catholics. The basis of this claim is the doctrine that Jesus Christ, as sovereign Ruler of all mankind, has committed to the rulers of His Church authority over all who bear the baptismal character on their soul. This authority is not dependent on whether or not the baptized persons in question acknowledge it. The case is analogous to that of a person who becomes by birth a citizen of a certain country, and in consequence is bound to obey its laws, whatever may be his personal inclinations in the matter. The priest must not hesitate to assert this claim of the Church in his sermons and instructions, even though some of his hearers may misunderstand and condemn it. The most practical application of this claim occurs in the Church's marriage legislation. The Church exempts baptized non-Catholics from certain restrictions, such as the impediment of disparity of cult and the observance of the prescribed form.[16] But other ecclesiastical impediments, such as consanguinity and affinity, are extended to baptized non-Catholics as well as to Catholics. Honesty and loyalty to the Catholic faith demand that we inform non-Catholics of these facts when the occasion calls for it, without any ambiguity, even though we feel they may resent it. Our Blessed Lord did not hesitate to claim all power in heaven and on earth, whatever may have been the reaction of his enemies; and in a similar fashion the Church, endowed with a share of His sovereign dominion, fearlessly asserts her spiritual authority over all the baptized. The priest, the spokesman of the Church, should be equally fearless.

[16] Canon 1070, §1; 1099, §3, 2.

It is particularly in public appearances with clergymen of other denominations that the priest must be careful not to compromise the doctrine that Catholicism is the only true religion. In functions of a purely civil or patriotic nature the danger is not so great, but it increases in proportion as the topic of religion comes to the fore. The participation of a priest with non-Catholics in any function which gives the impression that religious differences are to be subordinated to the interests of social or civic unity cannot be tolerated. For example, if a priest should appear in the company of a minister and a rabbi on a platform decorated with Christian and Jewish insignia bearing the caption: "Have we not all one Father?" to exemplify "Three Faiths in one Brotherhood," it is difficult to see how he can escape the charge of teaching indifferentism. Similarly, the statement that "we must respect religious differences" cannot be harmonized with the Catholic doctrine that religious differences are opposed to the will of God, who has commanded that all men accept the one true religion.

Finally, if the priest invites lay speakers for a Holy Name rally, a communion breakfast, etc., he should have some assurances beforehand that the speeches will be in accord with the Catholic faith, otherwise he will be faced with the obligation of correcting heretical pronouncements. On such an occasion the average non-Catholic speaker will have made two statements before five minutes have passed—first, that he has many dear friends who are Catholics; second, that it doesn't make much difference what religion a person professes, as long as he leads a clean, honest life. The Catholic lay speaker (particularly if he is a candidate for public office and the speech is to be printed in the newspapers) is very likely to say the same thing, except that he will refer to the many dear friends he counts among Protestants and Jews.

II.

Undoubtedly, there is a large group of our Catholic laity in American today who may be designated as "liberal Catholics," according to the definition recently given in the *Brooklyn Tablet:*

> A "liberal Catholic" is one who concedes that certain doctrines of his faith—perhaps all of them—are open to challenge. He admits, or

by his silence agrees, that one religion is as good as another, that the Church is over-severe in some of her doctrines, that the Barque of Peter should get modern. Then he often feels called upon to belittle the Pope or to show his superior attitude by looking down on the clergy, the laity or any genuine Catholic activity. If the Pope or bishops speak out on a current topic, he feels duty-bound to oppose their views or to water them down. He can see bad in all things Catholic and good in all things anti-Catholic. He is the essence of tolerance for the defamers of religion but cool to the champions of it—he does not like the latters' tactics or maybe their pronunciation. He is at home with the critics of religion, but always scary of the exemplary practitioners thereof. He believes that Catholics and the Church should always be ready to compromise and that apologies should be the first order of the day. He accepts racial and religious freedom in theory as something noble, but advocates it in practise for everybody except Catholics.[17]

Perhaps it was to Catholics of this type that Bishop Oxnam, of the Methodist Church, president of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, referred when he asserted (after a vehement denunciation of the Catholic Church's efforts to "stifle religious liberty"): "I know Roman Catholic statesmen, jurists, industrialists, labor leaders, teachers, scientists and priests who are eager to join hands with their Protestant brethren to establish a society in which the sacredness of every personality is recognized and in which there hovers over all a sense of the reality of the Christ-like God so that worship may inspire service as service expresses brotherhood."[18]

To this class of "liberal Catholics" belongs the Catholic columnist of a widely circulated newspaper who wrote: "In the end it makes little difference here below which gateway a man uses to enter heaven. The important thing is to stay on the highway." Another example is the prominent Catholic who was featured in the society page some months ago as acting as godfather at a Protestant baptism.

Priests who have the pastoral care of Catholics of this type should deem it their duty to admonish or to instruct them, however exalted they may be by worldly standards. Beyond doubt, ignorance rather than malice is often the source of their "liber-

[17] *Brooklyn Tablet*, Oct. 20, 1945, p. 9.

[18] *New York Times*, Oct. 29, 1945, p. 15.

alism," and a kindly, logical explanation of the true Catholic attitude may rectify their ideas. However, if the chief motive of their "liberalism" is the desire to win the good-will of non-Catholics for political or business advantages, they should be told quite bluntly that all the temporal benefits that the world can offer will not justify them in compromising Catholic principles.

Mixed marriages constitute a grave danger to the faith of the Catholic party and of the children who may be born of the union. Hence, the Church "most severely prohibits them everywhere."[19] Yet the number of mixed marriages that take place annually in the United States is appalling. One reason is the impression, commonly prevailing among Catholics, that to render a mixed marriage lawful nothing more is needed than the willingness of the couple to sign the prescribed guarantees. Now, the Code makes it quite clear that a mixed marriage is gravely sinful unless, in addition to the guarantees by the couple, there is a just and grave reason for contracting it and moral certitude that the guarantees will be fulfilled.[20] In their instructions priests should emphasize the need of a grave reason to justify a mixed marriage —and, of course, the mere fact that the two love each other is not such a reason. Furthermore, priests and bishops should remember that a dispensation for a mixed marriage is not valid unless there is moral certitude that the promises will be fulfilled. The mere fact that the non-Catholic is courteous and affable when he makes the promises is not sufficient assurance of such certitude—as experience has frequently proved. In view of the terrible inroads on the Catholic faith caused by mixed marriages, the clergy of the United States would do well to examine their conscience on their pastoral practise concerning this widespread evil.

In 1920 the Holy Office issued a directive to Ordinaries regarding the membership of Catholic young men in the Y. M. C. A.[21] The decree did not absolutely forbid such membership; hence, if a Catholic youth wishes to join this organization merely for the benefit of the athletic facilities and possesses sufficient knowledge of his faith and sufficient moral strength to give assurance that he will not be led into heresy or indifferentism, he might be allowed to join (apart from positive legislation by the bishop). But such a case must be regarded as exceptional; to the average boy or young man membership in the Y. M. C. A. is a grave spiritual

[19] Canon 1060. [20] Canon 1061. [21] *AAS*, XII (1920), 595.

danger. Our young folks should realize that the Catholic faith is worth much more than athletic or social advantages. Hence, the priest in whose parish there is a Y. M. C. A. centre must regard it his duty to warn the boys and young men of the danger of affiliation with this organization.

The wealthy Catholic who, for the sake of social prestige, sends his sons and daughters to secular schools or colleges when he could just as easily send them to Catholic institutions is certainly placing them in danger of losing their faith. It is even worse when a Catholic parent chooses for his children a professedly sectarian institution, such as a school under the auspices of the Episcopalian Church. Even though provisions are made for the children to attend Mass in a neighboring church, it is difficult to see how such a parent can be excused objectively from the guilt of mortal sin, and it will hardly ever be permissible for the confessor of such a parent to allow him to remain in good faith. But, in any event, priests should be reminded by such flagrant violations of parental duty that they have an obligation to proclaim constantly the Church's laws regarding the education of Catholic youth.

Some booksellers and publishers who are professedly Catholic and who even specialize in Catholic books are extremely lax in the type of literature they sell or publish. Not infrequently books which contain evident errors against faith are put on sale or advertized merely because they commend religion in a vague and general way. Similarly, there are Catholic periodicals whose reviewers do not hesitate to recommend to "discriminating readers" books evidently condemned by the general norms laid down by Canon Law.[22]

The participation of non-Catholics in Catholic religious functions is another subject on which priests can profitably instruct their people. Of course, one who is not a member of the Catholic Church could not validly officiate as godparent at baptism.[23] Only Catholics should ordinarily be chosen as witnesses for a Catholic wedding; a grave reason is required to justify the choice of non-Catholics. Similarly, when the body of a Catholic is being borne to the grave, this function should be performed ordinarily by Catholics. As far as the participation of Catholics in non-

[22] Canon 1399. [23] Canon 765.

Catholic services is concerned, we have the law of the Church absolutely forbidding any active assistance, and permitting passive assistance only for a grave reason.[24] It would be well for priests to attack the root of such problems, the excessive fraternization of Catholics with those not of the household of the faith. True, Catholics are obliged to render to non-Catholics the ordinary manifestations of Christian friendship and charity. But unfortunately there are Catholics who choose to associate with non-Catholics in preference to members of the Catholic Church; and such Catholics are certainly running the risk of weakening their faith and of slipping into indifferentism. Those especially who reside in strongly Catholic communities should be admonished to cultivate primarily the friendship of their co-religionists. The ancient legislation of the Church forbidding even civil association with tolerated heretics was revoked many centuries ago,[25] but the reason which prompted this legislation, the danger to the faith from too much contact with persons hostile to the Catholic Church, is still an important factor to be considered in regulating the social life of Catholics.

We have also the Catholic who vigorously denounces in general terms all discrimination on the basis of race, color or creed, but when he refers to particular cases is concerned only with anti-Semitism. Now, anti-Semitism is a despicable thing, directly contrary to Christian principles and it should be denounced. But anti-Catholicism is also despicable, and there is no reason why the Catholic who condemns the former should not condemn the latter just as vigorously. In fact, if we view conditions as they exist today throughout the United States, we shall probably conclude that antagonism to Catholics is more venomous and widespread than opposition to the Jews. And so, if Catholics wish to campaign against religious discrimination, they should include in their condemnation those who persecute the Catholic Church. If they study the European situation, they will find plenty of opportunities to expend their eloquence on the mass-murders of Catholic bishops, priests, and religious that are being perpetrated by our allied "democracy," Russia, in Poland and the Balkans.

[24] Canon 1258.

[25] Bancroft, *Communication in Religious Worship with non-Catholics* (Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1943), pp. 28 ff.

The particular points which have been emphasized in this article could be developed more fully, and others of equal importance could be added. However, it is hoped that enough has been said to convince the members of the clergy of their duty to preserve inviolate the precious heritage of Catholic faith and to avoid all that might obscure or defile this divine treasure, both in their own ministerial activities and in the words and conduct of the laity under their pastoral charge. We must not be disturbed if we are branded as narrow and bigoted by non-Catholics, and even by "liberal" Catholics; we must regard this as an inevitable consequence of consistent adherence to Catholic principles. Catholicism is narrow, just as the multiplication table is narrow—for both are true, and truth is intolerant of everything opposed to itself. And if it is bigotry to hold that a religion which was established by a mere man in the sixteenth century is not on a par with the religion established by the Son of God two thousand years ago, or that a person has no real right to reject the proved claim of Christ to be true God—then Catholics are bigoted.

Today men are waging deadly conflicts over problems that are relatively unimportant, such as the possession of small portions of territory and political power and economic advantages, while they are neglecting or ridiculing the questions of supreme importance, such as the existence of God, the immortality of the soul, and the obligations of the moral law. It behooves Catholics to strive primarily for the things of true value; and the protection and propagation of their faith surely belong to this category. We may not seek the good will of our fellow-men or temporal advantages by modulating or palliating the Catholic Church's claim to the exclusive possession of truth and to divinely granted authority over all mankind. If we attempt by diplomatic equivocation and soothing words to give non-Catholics the impression that the Church is an easy-going, compromising, "liberal" organization, we are unfaithful to our trust—and in addition we shall be distrusted and despised by those we are trying to appease. Let us rather proclaim unhesitatingly the challenge of Christ and of His Church to the world: "I am the way, the truth and the life. No one comes to the Father but through me."[26] Only thus shall we fulfill the pledge we made on the day of our ordination, when we

[26] *John* 14:6.

stood before the bishop and recited aloud the Apostles' Creed. God's blessing will not be on our work if we compromise; but it will be poured out abundantly on our ministry if we proclaim the whole truth clearly, regardless of the consequences. For it was only to those who teach men to observe *all* that He commanded that Christ made the promise: "Behold, I am with you all days, even unto the consummation of the world."[27]

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

The Catholic University of America,
Washington, D. C.

[27] *Matt.* 28:20.

THE DIFFICULTIES OF CONTROVERSY

The controversy with our opponents is not simple, but various and manifold; when a Catholic is doing one thing he cannot be doing another; yet the common answer made to his proof of this point is, that it is no proof of that. Thus men shift about, silenced in nothing, because they have not yet been answered in everything. Let them admit what we have already proved, and they will have a claim on us for proof of more. One thing at a time is the general rule given for getting through a business well, and it applies to the case before us. In a large and complicated question it is much to settle portions of it; yet this is so little understood, that a course of lectures might profitably confine itself simply to the considerations of the canons to be observed in disputation. Catholics would have cause to congratulate themselves, though they were able to proceed no further than to persuade Protestants to argue out one point before going on to another. It would be much even to get them to give up what they could not defend, and to promise that they would not return to it. It would be much to succeed in hindering them from making a great deal of an objection till it is refuted, and then suddenly considering it so small that it is not worth withdrawing. It would be much to hinder them from eluding a defeat on one point by digressing upon three or four others, and then presently running back to the first, and then to and fro, to second, third and fourth, and treating each in turn as if quite a fresh subject on which not a word had yet been said.

—Cardinal Newman, in *Lectures on the Present Position of Catholics in England* (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1896), pp. x f.

THE DEAF APOSTOLATE

Some years ago, the Redemptorist Father Galvin remarked: "Our Catholic deaf people are falling away from the Church like leaves in autumn." He supported his statement by some staggering figures which showed that a majority (two-thirds) of deaf people had been lost to the Catholic faith. Sacred Scripture tells us that faith comes by hearing, and it is a known fact that faith can be increased by hearing. But where there is little or no capacity to hear, in the physical sense of the word, the faith may never penetrate, or it may easily wane and die out. The Master, Jesus Christ, implied that someone must preach to the deaf when He commissioned His apostles to teach all men. And He also reminded us that any service to the least of His brethren is a service to Him.

The words "mute" and "dumb" are now outmoded in educational circles. The term "deaf" includes those who are not only without hearing but also without speech—those formerly called "deaf-mutes" or "deaf and dumb." The term "hard of hearing" is used for people who can speak but who have some partial hearing impediment. We shall adhere to this terminology which is in common use in the secular schools.

In the state schools, the use of the sign language in educating the deaf is frowned upon; they use the "oral method" or "lip reading." But what we might call the "Catholic position" in this matter favors the "combined method." This method advocates the use of lip reading, but retains also the use of the sign language. The Church does not wish to neglect any possible avenue of approach for the salvation of souls.

Priests engaged in the apostolate for the deaf, therefore, must learn to acquire a facile knowledge of the sign language, communicating ideas by signs instead of by words. We must not lose sight of the fact that words themselves are only conventional vocal signs significant of ideas. Language can be learned by manual signs as well as by vocal signs. While sounds are the chief means of social communication, they are not the only form of communication; visual communication is of some importance to all people, and of extreme importance to people who cannot communicate by sounds. The Abbé de l'Epée, a French priest of the seventeenth

century, is regarded as the founder of the sign language. The classic book on this form of communication, a book today in use throughout the United States, is the one written by Fr. Higgins. It should be in the possession of every priest working among the deaf.

The magazine in wide use among the deaf is *Ephpheta,* a monthly, edited by Rev. Michael A. Purtell, S.J., of Inisfada College, Manhasset, L. I., New York. Its subscription price is one dollar a year.

To assist the priests engaged in this work, lay men and women have formed an auxiliary association. The purpose of this auxiliary is to raise funds and to supply social entertainment for the deaf. Close to ten thousand dollars have been raised during the past few years through card parties. This money comes principally from people with normal hearing who are concerned about their deaf friends in Christ. Young girls of normal hearing take up the study of the sign language in order to be able to assist the priest at social functions. To say the least, this apostolic work is having a sanctifying effect on the lay people engaged in it. Their own personal lives are becoming more radiant with Christian love and holiness.

In the Diocese of Brooklyn, with whose work the author is especially concerned, a typical month's program for the deaf apostolate might run as follows:

Centers for the Deaf:

1. Holy Innocents: 3rd Sunday at 4 p. m. (Fr. Cribbin).
2. St. Brigid's: 4th Thursday at 8 p. m. (Fr. O'Grady).
3. St. Michael's: 4th Sunday at 4 p. m. (Fr. Sherman).
4. St. Joseph's: 2nd Sunday at 4 p. m. (Fr. Haye).

Center for Hard of Hearing:

St. Joseph's: 3rd Sunday at 4 p. m.

Confessions:

Every Saturday at St. Joseph's rectory.

The meetings held at the centers usually consist of a sermon, Benediction, social entertainment, and refreshments. At the meetings for the hard of hearing, equipment used consists of a microphone, amplifiers, and individual hearing aids. At the meetings for the deaf, sermons are delivered in sign language.

Besides the sermons delivered at the meetings, a sermon in very

simple language is included in the *St. Joseph News,* which is sent monthly to each deaf and hard of hearing person. (This news sheet also contains the list of centers.)

The census is an important factor in the deaf apostolate. In the Brooklyn diocese there are approximately one thousand deaf people and many, many thousands of people who are hard of hearing. A Trinitarian nun began the census work. Lately it has been done by young Catholic high school students. A constant census is going on at the present time.

In regard to employment, the deaf were well-off during the period of war, but find it more difficult to get work in time of peace. Employers in many large companies were begging for deaf workers during war time. We hope they will not forget about the deaf now that war is over. This point has been driven home at times by one of the priests speaking over a local radio station. A plea was made to employers to give the deaf a fair trial. At many jobs they are just as able and efficient as a person of normal hearing, and at some jobs they seem to be superior in concentration. One man in Newark was looking for fifty deaf girls to work in a wrapping department. He explained that, because of the many surrounding noises, people of normal hearing became too nervous at work. He hit upon the idea of hiring deaf people. The Brooklyn diocese has a special employment agency, gratis, for the benefit of the deaf and hard of hearing.

Some time ago we came across a deaf man who was unemployed, homeless and friendless. Each night he slept in an automobile parked in some garage. Each morning he would rise from sleep, stiff and cold and hungry. Then he would go around from house to house, picking newspapers and junk out of the garbage cans. These he collected until he felt he had enough to get about twenty cents from a junk-dealer. This money bought his food for one day. Tomorrow the same story and the next day. A job would have taught him his human dignity.

During the course of the year a mission is held for the deaf. The last one was given by Fr. Landherr the Redemptorist. Some of the deaf also arrange among themselves to make retreats in nearby cities. Each year a retreat is conducted for the hard of hearing. Two Communion breakfasts have been held during this past year.

In regard to hearing aids, we may add that they have been in-

stalled in the confessionals of a few Catholic hospitals as well as in quite a few parish confessionals. The great task still remains of "selling the idea" to pastors; every fairly large parish has a goodly number of hard of hearing people.

Up to date the deaf apostolate has brought the priest into court cases as interpreter; into cases of compensation for injuries at work into hospitals and prisons; into private homes. The work has been discussed in lectures to nuns, to nurses; to all kinds of parish societies; to school children; to Catholic Charities social workers, and to St. Vincent de Paul social workers. It is a bigger field than one might imagine.

At the diocesan seminary young students for the priesthood continue with great zeal to master the sign language during their free time. A few always keep up their interest in this work and continue it during their priestly life. In the seminary lies the hope for the future of the deaf apostolate.

The Church has desired to show her approval of this work by granting a plenary indulgence at the hour of death for anyone who dies within the year he worked for the salvation of the deaf.

In the matter of reading material, we are happy to say that the *International Catholic Truth Society* has been most gracious and kind in giving us without cost one hundred copies of any pamphlet every month. These pamphlets have been given out at the monthly meetings—to be taken home and read at leisure during the interval between meetings. Catholic doctrine is thus passed on in readable form.

In the case of our poor, old deaf people, we have been fortunate to win the kind co-operation of the Little Sisters of the Poor. They have been most helpful in accepting such people and in disposing them for heavenly happiness. We owe the Little Sisters much thanks and many prayers.

Are there future needs? Yes. We could very well use a central recreational center, as well as a home for the aged deaf and a community of nuns to specialize in this apostolate.

Among the hard of hearing there is a group of six women comprising a Legion of Mary under the title of "Mary, Mother of the Afflicted." This group has already done and still continues to do marvelous work among the afflicted of their own Auditorial Society.

The publicity angle of the work is handled principally through

the diocesan newspaper, *The Tablet.* Write-ups and advertisements in this paper make the work known to the priests and people of the diocese. Of course, the entire work has the full approval of His Excellency, Most Reverend Thomas E. Molloy, Bishop of Brooklyn. The apostolate for the deaf has received considerable recognition in recent years, having been considered in the sessions of the National Educational Conventions and in various sections of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine. Through these media a knowledge of the work for the deaf must spread to the remotest towns of the country. Every diocese must recognize, face, and solve this problem for itself.

In regard to the deaf and speechless, they may write their sins for confession. Printed forms are now being distributed. These forms contain the whole matter for confession. The people just write in the number of times. These forms make for greater neatness, legibility and even reverence. A specimen form follows:

Confession for the Speechless

Prayer: O Good God, help me to know my sins, give me courage to confess them, and give me grace to stop sinning.

Bless me, Father.

My last confession was .....weeks; .....months; ..... years.

I did say my penance (write yes or no).....

I hid a big sin in confession.....times. Name the sin.....

I did not say my morning and night prayers.....times.

I signed bad things against the priest and holy things.....times.

I did not go to Mass on Sundays & Holydays through my fault..... times.

I was late for Mass through my fault.....times.

I laughed or signed without need in church.....times.

I ate meat on Fridays through my fault.....times.

I cursed or swore or used bad words.....times.

I took God's Name in vain.....times.

I did not obey my parents or superiors.....times.

I was angry.....times.

I was not patient.....times.

I was jealous.....times.

I was proud.....times.
I was lazy.....times.
I was a little drunk.....times; very much drunk.....times.
I ate so much as to make me sick.....times.
I looked at bad things.....times.
I went to bad shows.....times.
I made bad signs.....times.
I thought of, or wished for, bad things.....times.
I did bad actions alone.....times; with others.....times.
I stole.....times. What did you steal?.....
I promise to give back what I stole (write yes or no).....
I did harm to things which belong to other people.....times.
I will pay for the damage (write yes or not).
I did not keep the fast days through my fault.....times.
I told lies.....times.
I spoke of other people's faults without need.....times.
Write down any other sins you think of.....
.....

Act of Sorrow: (say this in your mind before you go to confession). O my God, I am truly sorry for all my sins, because You are so good, and with the help of Thy Grace, I wish to sin no more.

(After your confession, kneel in church and say your penance. If you do not know what penance the priest gave you, say Five Our Fathers for all your sins.

Notices of meetings for the deaf and hard of hearing are occasionally sent out to all the pastors of the diocese as a reminder of this apostolate. Notices are also sent to hospitals and other institutions of the diocese. It is extremely important for the good of the work that a knowledge of it be spread very widely. A most practical way of reaching the priests is through a paper at the clergy conferences. Bishop Molloy requested that this be done at the conferences in Brooklyn a few years ago.

In conclusion let us say that the hard of hearing seem even more neglected than the deaf, but that both types need much more attention than we have given them up to the present time. The war will produce many more similar afflictions. The Church must be ready and priests must be equipped to minister to the deaf. This apostolate must grow and prosper. It is part of the mission of the Church.

GEORGE J. HAYE

Astoria, L. I.

NATURE AND THE SUPERNATURAL LIFE

During the past few years American priests have seen the rise and the advance within our country of what must be described as an extraordinary school of Christian spirituality. Quite recently Fr. John J. Hugo has given literary expression to the characteristic tenets of this school in his book *Applied Christianity*[1] and in a bound set of his mimeographed notes, entitled *Nature and the Supernatural.*[2] Both the book and the notes (the latter written, incidentally, to answer certain criticisms offered by Dr. Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R., some of which are contained in his notice on *Applied Christianity* in the July 1945 issue of *The American Ecclesiastical Review*),[3] have been very widely distributed. Fr. Hugo's obviously high purpose and his no less patent forensic skill have contributed towards making his writings decidedly influential.

While *Applied Christianity* has found many earnest, even vehement, supporters, it has also encountered a great deal of opposition. Many of those who have read both *Applied Christianity* and *Nature and the Supernatural* believe that these works contain what is at best a misleading presentation of Catholic teaching on the relation between the supernatural and the natural orders. And, despite the protestations of some of the more enthusiastic advocates of these writings, it can hardly be said that all opposition to them and to the system they propound stems from worldliness, naturalism, or lack of theological acumen on the part of the objectors.

In considering the debates that have arisen as a result of Fr. Hugo's writings, it is well to remember that these writings present a system of spirituality which has been the subject of lively discussion for the past ten years and which has stimulated the production of some noteworthy books and articles. The type of spiritual instruction contained in *Applied Christianity* first attracted widespread attention during the latter part of the last

[1] The book was privately printed in New York in 1944. It contains 217 pages.

[2] *Nature and the Supernatural* is composed of 141 mimeographed pages bound together in book form. It has been widely distributed to priests and seminarians along the eastern seaboard. The inside of the back cover carries Luke 11:52, apparently as a warning to Dr. Connell.

[3] Cf. *AER*, CXIII, 1 (July, 1945), 69 ff.

decade, when it appeared in certain retreats given to diocesan priests and religious, both in this country and in Canada, by Fr. Lacouture, a Canadian Jesuit. Unfortunately only unpublished notes of these retreats exist, and these offer hardly sufficient evidence for any worth-while judgement on the system as a whole.

In 1938, however, the distinguished Canadian priest, Fr. Anselme Longpré, published his famous book *La folie de la croix*,[4] written explicitly as an introduction to the study of Fr. Lacouture's spiritual exercises. *La folie de la croix* is a powerful and well-written volume. In many respects it still remains the best exposition of Fr. Lacouture's theories.

In the Aug. 1941 issue of *Le séminaire*, the Canadian Sulpician, Dr. Roland Fournier, published his article "Grâce et nature,"[5] an essay which objected strongly to the key theses of *La folie de la croix*. Dr. Fournier's article encountered immediate and lively opposition. Among the replies to Dr. Fournier's pronouncement was another article entitled "Grâce et nature," written by Dom Crenier in a special issue of *Bulletin de Saint Benoit*.[6] The first few paragraphs of Dom Crenier's article show how the controversy appeared to the advocates of Fr. Longpré's views.

> For some years a struggle, as interesting as it is unequal, has been going on in the Province [of Quebec].
>
> Among Christian people, two tendencies confront each other.
>
> Many do not realize the seriousness of this conflict, which is in reality a combat *in coelestibus* between the good and the evil angels.
>
> An immense throng of Christians was on the verge of slipping very gently towards paganism and damnation, for the sake of comfort, of well-being, and of "permitted" pleasures. Certain priests had the idea of an attempt to react [against this tendency], and set themselves to preach the Sermon on the Mount.
>
> This evangelical teaching, which is the very foundation of Christianity, was so far forgotten that it produced the effect of a new, revolutionary doctrine, even related to certain heresies.

---

[4] Saint-Hyacinthe, 1938.

[5] Cf. *Le séminaire*, VI, 2 (Aug. 1941), 140 ff.

[6] This article appeared in a special issue of *Bulletin de Saint Benoit*. This number is *hors série* and was meant exclusively for the clergy. The article is dated Sept. 29, 1941. Written in the same spirit and from the same point of view is Canon Beaumier's pamphlet "*Langage Spirituel*" *dans la prédication*, defending a retreat preached in Trois-Rivières in January, 1940, by Fr. Saey.

It is interesting to see, among Christian people, among the clergy and the communities, the two camps which have been formed, for and against this doctrine, as if one had to approve or to disapprove the Sermon on the Mount. It is more interesting than consoling.[7]

The acrimony which characterizes Dom Crenier's article is entirely lacking from the latest important Canadian contribution to the debate, the learned *Synthèse théologique sur le renoncement chrétien*, by the University of Montreal professor, Dr. Fernand Paradis, S.S.[8] This valuable book appeared last year. It should do a great deal towards ending what has been, all in all, a singularly unfortunate controversy.

In the United States the best-known statements on this debated matter are to be found in the writings of Fr. Hugo and of Dr. Connell. The first important American pronouncement in this field is to be found in Dr. Paschal P. Parente's paper, "Nature and Grace in Ascetical Theology," published in the June 1943 number of *The American Ecclesiastical Review*.[9] Dr. Parente's article is obvious and forceful warning against the teaching afterwards presented in *Applied Christianity*.

While the system of spirituality advocated in *Applied Christianity* and in *Nature and the Supernatural* has also been expounded by Canadian priests, writing in the French language, it is perfectly clear that most Americans have learned of it through the works of Fr. Hugo. Hence, for all practical purposes, it is expedient to consider the system as he has presented it.

Because Fr. Hugo's writings have aroused great interest, and because the subject he treats is of vital importance, it is quite imperative that American priests should be well informed in this field. If the spiritual leaders of our people form inaccurate or confused judgements on the points involved in the controversy occasioned by these books, a situation seriously disadvantageous to Catholicism in the United States may well develop. Such inaccurate and confused judgements arise, for example, when opponents of Fr. Hugo's system condemn it as "too strict," and when advocates of this teaching claim that any objection to it involves an attack on the practice of Christian mortification. Such over-simplifications tend to obscure the paramount fact

[7] P. 1.
[8] Grand Séminaire de Montréal, 1945.
[9] Cf. *AER*, CVIII, 6 (June, 1943), 430 ff.

that our one concern in doctrine about the spiritual life must be to give our people exactly the teaching which God gave to the world through our Lord Jesus Christ and which He presents infallibly through the *magisterium* of the Catholic Church. The only test that matters for any book or for any system dealing with doctrine of faith or of morals is that of conformity with the Catholic message. "Strictness" and personalities have nothing to do with the case.

When we come to examine in the light of Catholic teaching the system of spirituality advocated in Fr. Hugo's *Applied Christianity*, we find that there can be nothing more eminently laudable than what is obviously the ultimate purpose of the book. Fr. Hugo sets out to urge his readers to make the supernatural love of charity for God the dominating motive force in their lives. This is a lesson which needs to be stressed, and which cannot be over-emphasized. Furthermore the author is perfectly correct in his contention that supernatural charity is not only opposed to sin, but also ineffably better than even the most perfect human activity within the purely natural order. He has also done fine work in reminding his readers of the necessity of detachment from creatures and of the duty of Christian mortification.

Unfortunately, however, when he comes to explain the relations between the orders of grace and of nature, his teaching is sometimes confusing and sometimes downright inaccurate. Some of his inaccurate statements are more or less incidental to his system. Others have to do with essential points in his doctrine. Outstanding among these last are his pronouncements on natural motives and on natural affections.

Applied Christianity unequivocally advises its readers to rid themselves of all natural motives, both good and harmful.

It may also be objected: "Not all natural motives lead to sin. It would be possible to teach children, for example, to obey rules out of love for good order. Here is a natural motive from which no harm can come."

This is true: yet *in practice* it is impossible to distinguish between natural motives that are harmful and those that are not. Many of those that seem to be harmless may afterwards be harmful: to get children to study, we can arouse their sense of competition, which may lead to great selfishness.

> Hence, it is impossible to distinguish good from selfish natural motives *in practice; and* it is, therefore, best to get rid of them all.[10]

A *motive* is some consideration or reason which impels us to act in one way rather than in another. A *natural* motive is one which is ascertainable even without the aid of Christian revelation. Thus, as this passage from *Applied Christianity* stands, it urges us not to allow our actions to be influenced at all by any reason within the sphere of the human mind's natural competence.

Now it is a fundamental principle in the field of Catholic spirituality that all of our activity should be governed by the supernatural love of friendship for God which we call charity. In other words we are called upon to perform every one of our actions ultimately to please God, to do His will, in so far as His will and pleasure are made known to us through the body of supernatural Christian revelation. Thus it would be a serious mistake on the part of any Catholic to have a supreme or ultimately determining motive which is other than supernatural and other than that of charity. There are, however, other considerations which are real motives because they really determine and influence our activity, but which, at the same time, can be themselves subordinated to the supreme motive which is the supernatural friendship for God.

Occasionally, at any rate, the force and the sincerity of a man's charity for God may be measured in terms of his willingness to use these subordinate motives and to direct the activity prompted by these secondary considerations to the supernatural service of God. A striking example of such a situation is described in what will always have been one of the great masterpieces of missionary literature, Fr. Mark Tennien's recent book, *Chungking Listening Post.*

The Maryknoll priest found himself, in effect, the actual fiscal agent for the entire body of Catholic missioners in Free China.

> China's ever-changing economic situation now became a matter of vital interest to me. I had to decide whether the various subsidies should be sent in lump sums or installments, and whether they should sometimes be delayed in hope of a better rate of exchange later on. On such decisions hung material gain or loss for the missions.[11]

---

[10] *Applied Christianity*, p. 39.

[11] *Chungking Listening Post* (New York: Creative Age Press, Inc., 1945), p. 22.

Obviously the immediate motive guiding the conduct of a man in this position was the proper administration of the money entrusted to his care. It was his intention to prevent any dissipation of his funds by reason of the constant shift of exchange values in the country to which he was assigned. Certainly there can be no doubt that this motive, *taken by itself*, is something natural. What makes activity of this type precious in the sight of the Lord is the fact that the immediate motive, and the activity influenced by it, were both subordinated to the supreme design of supernatural charity.

Taken literally, the advice contained in *Applied Christianity* would have dissuaded Fr. Tennien from considering, or at least from being in any way influenced by, the natural motive of conserving funds. Unfortunately it would also have prevented him from doing what is objectively one of the greatest works of charity in the modern history of the Catholic Church.

It may be objected (and as a matter of fact the observation has been made) that this is not exactly what the author of *Applied Christianity* means in the passage we have quoted. Some have claimed that he considers all the reasons which contribute towards the determination of an action as *one* motive, and that he merely insists that the ultimate or supreme determinant should be that of divine and supernatural charity. If this interpretation be correct, then all that Fr. Hugo meant to say in the passage in which he advises us to get rid of all natural motives, the good ones as well as those which are harmful, was that we should never act out of motives which are not dominated by charity.

This, of course, is a primary principle in all the traditional literature of Catholic spirituality. Unfortunately, however, even though this be what is meant in the passage from *Applied Christianity*, it is not what is said in that passage. *Applied Christianity* does not confine itself to the perfectly correct insistence that we should see to it that all we do is done for the love of God. It holds that we should take no cognizance whatever of any reason or determinant for action which could be appreciated apart from divine revelation.

When we praise God because of His omnipotence, His wisdom, and His mercy, we are utilizing motives which can properly be called natural. When we intend to act according to the dictates of the acquired virtues of justice or gratitude or veracity, we are

certainly utilizing natural motives also. Obviously these motives should not be the ultimate and supreme determinants of our activity. We are expected always to act in such a way as to please God, in so far as we know Him and the eternal decrees of His will through the content of divine supernatural revelation. Still, God does demand that the motives of justice and veracity and gratitude should be real determinants in our lives. It is certainly not in accordance with His teaching to urge men to get rid of such motives.

Fr. Hugo's teaching on natural affections is quite in line with his doctrine on natural motives.

> In order to possess ourselves of supernatural happiness, we must give up all natural affections. . . . This death of the natural takes place independently of sin, whether original or personal sin. The necessity of dying to nature derives from the very fact that we have a supernatural destiny. Our supernatural destiny requires that we abandon the merely natural plane of living.[12]

Applied Christianity offers two scripture texts as proofs for the above assertions. The first is a passage from St. John's Gospel: "He that loveth his life shall lose it, and he that hateth *his life in this world*, keepeth it unto life eternal."[13] The second is a verse from the Gospel according to St. Luke: "If any man will be my disciple, let him deny himself and take up his cross daily and follow me."[14]

Neither of the texts has the slightest reference to an abandonment of all natural affections. The text from St. John teaches that the man who makes his own life his ultimate end in this world will be a failure, while the person who *hates* his life in this world (in the sense that a follower of Christ is expected to hate his own parents, that is, by preferring God to them), will set the service of God in charity before his own individual good, and will thus reap the reward of eternal life. The second text insists upon the necessity of continuing mortification. It does not teach that all natural affections are to be abandoned.

An affection is an act of an appetitive faculty. A natural affection is one of the sort of which man would be capable without any elevation to the order of grace. With the exception of prudence and certain of its allied virtues, all of the acquired moral

[12] *Applied Christianity*, p. 87. [13] *John* 12:25. [14] *Luke* 9:23.

virtues are built up by and are themselves the sources of natural affective activity. When, in a book which makes a great point of distinguishing good from sinful natural activity, we are bidden to give up all natural affections, it is difficult to see how such advice could be taken to mean anything less than the abandonment of all activity connected with the acquired moral virtues.

Gratitude is a natural affection. So is proper love for our own parents. If we live rightly according to the dictates of Christian revelation, we must exercise this obligatory but still essentially natural activity. Actually some of the bitterest words of our Lord recounted in the Gospels are those in which He rebukes the pharisees for instructing their pupils that the natural love for parents should be replaced by some other concern.

The confusion and the inaccuracies which abound in *Applied Christianity* stem in large measure from the author's careless use of the terms "nature" and "natural," as well as from a serious flaw in his practical treatment of the supernatural order. Fr. Hugo makes much of his distinction of a triple order of activity in *Applied Christianity*. He uses a very efficient schema to indicate that there are three possible levels of human life. The first level is that of supernatural activity, proceeding from charity, guided by faith, and destined for heaven. The second is that of natural activity, enlightened by reason and proceeding towards the natural happiness of limbo. The third and lowest level is that of sin, which involves disobedience to God, is motivated by human appetites, and tends towards hell.[15] In *Nature and the Supernatural* he appeals again to this distinction, and, in one of his less felicitous passages, charges Dr. Connell with the offence of teaching that all activity which is not supernaturally meritorious must be sinful.[16]

Unfortunately, however, once he gets into the body of his instruction, Fr. Hugo speaks as though there were only two levels of human operation possible for the men of this world. In a different order of divine providence it would be possible to have good natural activity proceeding from an untarnished nature. In the order in which we live, according to his teachings, this type of natural activity is for all practical purposes non-existent.

[15] Cf. *Applied Christianity*, p. 14.
[16] Cf. *Nature and the Supernatural*, pp. 5 ff.

Applied Christianity distinguishes sedulously between two meanings of the word "nature."

> Now while it is true to say that human nature is essentially good, it must not be forgotten for a moment what the *actual* condition of this nature is. . . . Accordingly, we may distinguish two senses in which the word "nature" may be used. First it may be used of human nature considered in itself (*in se*), that is, in its essential stuff and properties, which are wholly good. To use the word in this way, however, is to use it in an abstract sense; for human nature does not actually exist in this pure state. Secondly, we may speak of nature as it exists in the concrete (*in re*, in reality), and here it is always hindered by the effects of original sin.[17]

On a subsequent page Fr. Hugo explains a similar distinction of meanings which can be attached to the term "reason," and then tells how these words are to be employed throughout the rest of his book.

> First of all, there is reason *in se*—pure reason or right reason; and this is an abstraction which does not actually exist. It is pure reason that we have in mind when we say that there is no contradiction between faith and reason. Then there is reason as it actually is, reason in the concrete, the reason that is darkened as a consequence of original sin.
>
> *In the following pages when we say that we must mortify and attack and destroy the "natural," we mean nature in the concrete. When we say that we must go against reason, or that faith conflicts with reason, we mean reason in the concrete.*[18]

What *Applied Christianity* has to say about reason and faith is disconcerting, to put it mildly. We are informed that the kind of reason which does not contradict the faith "is an abstraction which does not actually exist." The only existent reason, that which has been darkened by original sin, is, according to Fr. Hugo, something which can actually contradict the truths we believe by faith.

> If we consider this darkened reason, then, there may be *an actual contradiction* between faith and reason: as when faith teaches us to seek our joy only in God, and our darkened reason persuades us to look for consolation in the goods of the world.[19]

[17] *Applied Christianity*, p. 25.
[18] *Ibid.*, p. 28.
[19] *Ibid.*, p. 27.

Apparently *Applied Christianity* would have us believe that when the Vatican Council taught that "Although faith is above reason, there can still never be any true disagreement between faith and reason,"[20] it was referring to a mere abstraction, to something "which does not actually exist." Such a teaching is, of course, completely erroneous. Our reason has been darkened by original sin in the very real sense that we have a proclivity for error. At the same time, however, our minds are still competent to discover and to explain the truth. The teaching of faith has no disagreement with the verities which we find through the natural operation of our own reason. What is opposed to the faith is error which masquerades under the appearance of reason.

It would be tragic if a seminarian were to take the doctrine of *Applied Christianity* seriously and strive to interpret the truths of fundamental dogmatic theology in the light of the passages we have quoted. He would be led to imagine that the only reason which does not contradict faith is merely a non-existent abstraction. If he were to apply Fr. Hugo's doctrines in the domain of moral theology, he might be led to believe that when a writer like Merkelbach holds that "the more immediate and intrinsic norm of morality is practical human right reason,"[21] an unreal and actually ineffective standard of right and wrong is being described.

The passages in which Fr. Hugo speaks of a contradiction between existent reason and the doctrines of the faith are more redolent of irresponsible sensationalism than of scientific merit. His teaching on nature and the natural is hardly more accurate.

Had the author of *Applied Christianity*, in acting in accordance with the distinctions he indicated, confined himself to the task of urging his readers to combat the proclivity of nature towards sin in their own lives, his work would have been nothing more or less than the standard teaching of Catholic spirituality on the necessity of an active purification of the senses and of the soul. Had he insisted upon the necessity of referring even the acts of the acquired natural virtues towards God through the supernatural love of charity, his doctrine would have also been unexceptionable.

Instead, however, he has advised his followers to put away even good, as distinct from harmful natural motives, and has called upon them to abandon *all* natural affection. He has forgotten

[20] *DB*, 1797.

[21] *Summa theologiae moralis* (Paris, 1935), I, 115.

that natural acts are governed by a natural law, and that Christians are commanded to obey this natural law under penalty of sin. Some of the natural affections and the natural motives to which he refers are made obligatory by the very force of this law.

The Christian is called upon to exercise himself spiritually in order to counteract the proclivity towards sin which is within him as a result of original sin. He labors to mortify and to dominate his own tainted nature, but he certainly does not work to put all natural affections and all natural motives out of his life. As a matter of fact he could not fulfill the law of charity without obeying the very natural law which prescribes certain acts and motives which are themselves within the natural order.

Now it is perfectly true that obedience to the natural law alone is not sufficient for the Catholic. He is obligated and privileged to live according to those precepts contained in the intrinsically supernatural revelation which is infallibly presented in the teaching of the Catholic Church. Specifically the Catholic is expected to love God with the supernatural friendship of charity, and to make this affection the dominating motive of all his activity.

According to our blessed Lord Himself, a love for Him must involve the keeping of His commandments.[22] Some of these commandments obviously include those precepts of the decalogue which our Lord cited to the rich young man who came to ask about the possession of life everlasting.[23]

Now, in St. Paul's famed description of the supernatural love of God, we find that "Charity is patient, is kind: charity envieth not, dealeth not perversely, is not puffed up. Is not ambitious, seeketh not her own, is not provoked to anger, thinketh no evil: Rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth with the truth . . ."[24] The laws which govern these natural effects of charity are those contained in the Mosaic decalogue. And we have Fr. Hugo's word for it that "The chief precepts of the natural law are given in the Mosaic code."[25] If then we are to designate as natural those activities and those motives which are prescribed by the natural law, we have no right whatsoever to teach that we should give up all of this natural activity and all of these natural motives in order to live the life of charity.

[22] Cf. *John* 14:15.
[23] Cf. *Mark* 10:19.
[24] *I Cor.* 13:4-6.
[25] *Applied Christianity*, p. 18.

It remains perfectly true and vitally important that we should not limit ourselves to the sphere of merely natural activity. The author of *Applied Christianity* cannot be too highly praised for insisting upon this necessity. Nevertheless, he has left room for what may well be dangerous confusion in his practical explanation of what really constitutes the supernatural activity of charity.

> It is only by raising ourselves above the whole natural order that we become Christians. To do this, we must love God with our whole heart, whole soul, whole mind, whole strength. This means that we must withdraw our love from the things of the world, giving it all to God.[26]

On a subsequent page Fr. Hugo informs us that "The supernatural world is God's world, just as the natural world is man's."[27] Again we are told that "a supernatural life is one that is *ruled* by the love of God. A natural life is one that, at any rate in practical conduct, is ruled by the love of creatures."[28]

Statements of this sort reveal, or at least can engender, a dangerously twisted notion of what constitutes the supernatural order. The supernatural is presented as differing from the natural by the fact that the former involves an effective and sincere love for God, which is absent from the natural level of human activity. Natural activity in the concrete is presented as something which is essentially and necessarily dominated by love of creatures, while the supernatural seems to differ from it in being dominated by the love of God.

Actually, however, the natural law itself commands the love of God above all things. The two great commandments of the love of God and the love of neighbor are just as truly statements of the natural order as are the prescriptions of the decalogue itself. A man would not be good in the natural order unless he loved God above all things. Fr. Hugo's good pagan, who abstains from sensual indulgence while centering his affections on created things to the exclusion of God is, in the last analysis, just as truly in a state of sin as the fellow who lives like an animal, indulging himself in sensual pleasures.[29] It is extremely misleading, even in a

[26] *Ibid.*, p. 19. [27] *Ibid.*, p. 28. [28] *Ibid.*

[29] On p. 29 of *Applied Christianity* we are told that we can live "as animals, as pagans, or as Christians." On p. 14 of the same work we learn that "one may act as an angel, a pagan (a natural human being), or a devil." In both instances the activity of the pagan is represented as selfish, inconsiderate of God, and yet as conduct which is acceptable in the natural order.

popular book of spirituality, to present one who is recreant towards the duties of religion as conforming to the precepts of the natural law.

Actually, the love of charity which is incumbent upon Christians differs from the merely natural love of God, without which no man could be considered as good in the natural order, by reason of the way in which God is considered as the Object of this love. Naturally we are competent to love God as He is known in the light of His creatures. The natural love for God considers God as the first Cause of the created universe. Charity, on the other hand, is that love of benevolence or, more properly, friendship for God which is given to Him in so far as He is known in Himself, in the mysteries of His intimate life. In heaven charity is the affection by which we love God as we see Him in the clarity of the beatific vision. In this world it is the affection by which we love Him as He is perceived in the light of Christian and supernatural faith, through the acceptance of that revealed message which comes to us infallibly in the *magisterium* of the Catholic Church.

At the same time we must remember that any love for creatures to the exclusion of God, or any preference of a creature for God, must be classed as something evil, even judged by purely natural standards. The man who prefers his own pleasure to the will of God may be following the proclivities of his tainted nature, but he is acting in strict and obvious *violation* of the natural law. His is certainly not good natural activity.

Applied Christianity, in the section dealing with the interrelations between the natural and the supernatural orders, definitely leaves the impression that the supernatural order is above all something which merely fills in the gap which original sin produced in the natural order of human activity. Natural activity, in the concrete, is represented as dominated by a love of creatures. The supernatural order is dominated by the love of God. Since man should naturally love his Creator, it would be only legitimate to infer that the love which comes in the life of grace is simply a replacement for the affection which would have been within the competence of natural activity were it not for the tragedy of original sin.

Incidental to the teaching of *Applied Christianity* are certain other erroneous pronouncements on the spiritual life. The book

tells us that "no action, no matter how grand or good, which does not proceed from charity can be considered either as supernatural or as meritorious."[30] Now it is perfectly correct to say that only those actions which are motivated by divine and supernatural charity are meritorious. At the same time, however, there is a tremendous field of activity which is truly supernatural but which is not meritorious. This field includes all of that operation which is brought about under the influence of actual grace and which constitutes the preparation for justification.

Another incidental error which mars the book is Fr. Hugo's teaching on what constitutes a Christian. "The supernatural virtues alone," he tells us, "make me a Christian—faith, hope and charity."[31] Properly speaking, a Christian is a member of the society into which our Lord organized the band of His disciples. This society, which exists now, and will continue to exist in this world until the end of time, is the Catholic Church. Hence, properly speaking, the thing that makes any man a Christian is the factor which unites him within the communion of the Catholic Church.

In times past there were loyal and intelligent Catholic theologians who held that a man was constituted as a member of the Church through the possession of the virtue of divine faith. That view has fortunately been banished from the field of theology, once and for all, by the appearance of the *Mystici corporis*.[32] At this time there is no excuse whatsoever for teaching that a man is constituted as a Christian by the possession of the theological virtue of faith.

There was never any valid reason for saying that a man was constituted as a Christian through the possession of charity. It was the central ecclesiological error of the Lutherans that the possession of the state of grace, with which charity is inextricably connected, made a man a member of the true Church.[33] Against that particular error the Church has always had to fight.

[30] *Applied Christianity*, p. 11.

[31] *Ibid.*, p. 18.

[32] "Actually only those are to be included as members of the Church who have been baptized and profess the true faith, and who have not been so unfortunate as to separate themselves from the unity of the Body, or been excluded by legitimate authority for grave faults committed." (N.C.W.C. translation, n. 22).

[33] Cf. art. 7 in the Confession of Augsburg.

The Catholic reader of *Applied Christianity* will derive little profit from the presentation of this teaching. At a time when the temptation to indifferentism is so great in the world, it is unfortunate to find what may be regarded as a presentation of the "invisible Church" theory set forth in a work of Catholic spirituality.

Applied Christianity is a strange sort of book. Many of the doctrines which are set forth inaccurately or ambiguously in one portion of the volume are stated acceptably in some other part. The over-all effect of this work, however, is definitely pernicious. Despite Fr. Hugo's power of expression, and his manifest good intentions, it is unfortunate that his work has achieved its high measure of popularity. Those who follow its teachings will lose, rather than gain, in their appreciation of Catholic truth.

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON

The Catholic University of America,
Washington, D. C.

NATURAL AND SUPERNATURAL GIFTS

You must not imagine . . . that we would have you suppress individuality of character. All gifts of God, whether they be natural or supernatural, have their providential appointment, and it would be both foolish and sinful to let them wither away in unfruitfulness. You must stifle neither your affections nor your desires. Had Callicles contented himself with claiming for all forms of human activity the right of existence and faculty of expansion, Chrisitianity would not disown the Athenian conception of life. Moral action is both sustained and intensified by imagination and feeling—on this condition, however: that they move within their own spheres, and play none but the parts allotted to them.

—*Cardinal Mercier's Conferences* (Westminster, Md.: The Newman Bookshop, 1943), p. 176.

Answers to Questions

SINGING THE CORRECT *ITE MISSA EST*

Question: What is the obligation of singing the prescribed ***Ite missa est*** for those priests who *can* sing the various forms given in the Missal, if they would?

Answer: The obligation of singing the correct *Ite missa est* or *Benedicamus Domino,* when the Mass is chanted, is evidently of the same force as are the other rubrics governing singing during the celebration of Mass since the various tones are found in the *Ordo Missae,* of the Missal. True, *nemo ad impossibile tenetur,* and there are those who unfortunately cannot manage the inflections noted in the Missal but if the celebrant, or deacon, *can* execute the different chants he certainly *should* do so.

TONE OF VOICE AT MASS

Question: In a church where Masses are said simultaneously at several altars which are close together, what tone should the celebrant at the high altar use for the prayers at the foot of the altar and the last Gospel, etc.? When Mass at the high altar is a chanted Mass, what tone should be used for these prayers?

Answer: The rubrics of the Missal (*Rubricae Generales,* XVI, 1) prescribe two tones of voice to be used at Mass: ***vox clara*** and ***vox secreta,*** and details when each is to be used. The *Ritus servandus* of the Missal adds a third tone, ***vox media, vox aliquantulum elata,*** to be used on four occasions during the course of the Mass. The difference between these tones is to be understood not absolutely, but relatively, so that, while a distinction should be made even in the case when Masses are being said simultaneously in the same church, the ***vox clara*** is not to be so loud as to disturb other priests who are celebrating Mass at the same time. This also is a provision of the rubrics of the Missal (*loc. cit.,* 2).

At a sung Mass, whether High or Solemn, outside of the parts required to be sung or intoned by the celebrant, all those prayers which in Low Mass are said *clara voce* are here recited ***submissa voce*** (loc. cit., 3), which ceremonial authorities understand to be

the *vox media,* referred to in the preceding paragraph. For the blessing at the end of High Mass, however, the celebrant uses the *vox clara,* as at Low Mass, in conformity with the special direction of the rubrics of the Missal (*Ritus servandus,* XII, 7).

SOLEMN MASS WITH ONLY ONE MISSAL

Question: On the feast of Christ the King, when all was ready for Solemn Mass, we discovered that the church possessed only one Missal with the text of the Mass of the feast. Which was it better to do, contrive to use the same Missal for the celebrant as well as for the deacon and subdeacon or reserve the new Missal for the celebrant, the deacon and subdeacon using an older edition and singing the Epistle and Gospel of the Sunday after Pentecost?

Answer: There is naturally no authoritative answer to the query proposed as it represents an anomalous situation not contemplated by liturgical laws. However, for our own part, we do not favor the solution of the difficulty, which has the ministers sing the wrong Epistle and Gospel in order to avoid using the same missal as the celebrant. The better procedure would be to arrange for the use of the single up-to-date Missal. This would involve very little contriving for the Gospel and, in the case of the Epistle, we should have the subdeacon sing it before it is read by the celebrant since this is the regular procedure at Pontifical Mass, where the celebrating bishop reads the Epistle only after it has been chanted by the subdeacon. For next year, *caro mio,* see that an extra Missal is provided, which has at least an insert with the text of the Mass of *Christus Rex.*

THE USE OF A FUNERAL PALL

Question: Is it quite in accord with the rubrics to cover the coffin with a black pall for the Requiem Mass and the service of the absolution of the body? I have a vague memory of some prohibition of its use or of its restriction to services *absente corpore.*

Answer: While the use of a funeral pall is not prescribed by the rubrics of the Ritual, it is quite in accord with the directions of liturgical writers. Martinucci (Lib. IV, Cap. IX, 1 n.) says:

"Llicebit tamen feretro supponere pannum seu stratum nigri coloris ad ornamentum." Fortescue (*The Ceremonies of the Roman Rite Described*, p. 447) directs the use of the pall without qualification. Numerous instances of decrees of the Sacred Congregation of Rites presume the use of a funeral pall as they contain legislation with respect to it. Thus, on Aug. 4, 1905, the Sacred Congregation gave in answer to a *dubium:* "Colorem panni emortualis esse debere nigrum, ornamenta autem sobria esse debere."

The prohibition which our correspondent evidently has in mind concerns the impropriety of using an antependium or other bits of altar furniture for the decoration of the coffin or the catafalque which is used *absente corpore.* Hence, the Ritual itself (Tit. VI, Cap. 1, 19) contains this rubric: "Pallia, aut alia ornamenta Altaris ad ornatum feretri vel tumbae ne adhibeantur." The Sacred Congregation has also legislated against the use of a *white* pall for the obsequies of unmarried women or for nuns, even where the practice has been of long standing (*perantiqua consuetudo*). The decrees in question are Nos. 3035 and 4397, which reiterate the direction that the funeral pall, whether *praesente vel absente corpore*, is always to be black.

OMISSION OF A SIMILAR COMMEMORATION

Question: In arranging the Ordo for the Octave of St. Michael the question arose whether the Octave was to be commemorated on the feast of the Guardian Angels, since the orations seem to express practically same ideas. The majority of priests asked seem to think that the Commemoration should be omitted.

Answer: The case proposed is evidently one where the feast of St. Michael is the titular of the church concerned and hence a *duplex primae classis cum octava communi*, involving a coincidence of the fourth day within the octave of St. Michael with the feast of the Guardian Angels. We think that the octave of St. Michael should be commemorated *in casu.* It is true that it is a general principle of liturgy not to repeat in the office or Mass a prayer that is identical, or practically so, with one which has already been said. However, the prayer for the feast of St. Michael asks in a general way for the assistance of the heavenly spirits but

that for Oct. 2 begs the special protection of the guardian angels. Moreover, the antiphons both at Vespers and at Lauds are quite distinctive, definitely referring to St. Michael on Sept. 29 and equally definitely descriptive of the ministry of our celestial guardians on Oct. 2.

REQUIRED HYMNS AT BENEDICTION

Question 1: Are the *O Salutaris* and the *Laudate Dominum* of obligation at Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament or may other hymns be sung in their place?

Question 2: Is it permitted to sing hymns in English during the exposition of the Blessed Sacrament, concluding with Benediction?

Answer 1: The only hymn which is of strict obligation for Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament is the *Tantum ergo*. The *O Salutaris*, usually sung just after the actual exposition, and the *Laudate Dominum*, which is often sung at the conclusion of the ceremony, are matters of custom. Other hymns may be sung in their place or the chanting may be confined to the one required hymn, the *Tantum ergo* (Cf. S.R.C. 3058, 3).

Answer 2: The sacred Congregation of Rites (D. 3537, 3) has decided that it is permissible to sing hymns in the vernacular *coram SSmo Sacramento*, and hence at Benediction, provided the hymns in question are not official, liturgical chants, like the *Te Deum*. The *Tantum ergo* must always be sung in Latin.

WHICH ORDO?

Question: The chaplaincy of a Sisters' hospital has been entrusted to a religious community of priests for an indefinite period of time. It is the superior of this community who appoints the chaplain with the approval of the bishop. These Sisters do not have a calendar of their own. Is the chaplain to follow the diocesan or the Ordo of his own religious community? How about a diocesan priest who says Mass in this chapel?

Answer: A ready-made reply to the above question is found in Wuest-Mullaney's *Matters Liturgical*, p. 354: "In the oratories of nuns or other communities of pious persons erected by the com-

petent authority, unless they possess a proper calendar of their own, the calendar of the place, that is, of the diocese, must be followed with respect to the Mass, even by those religious priests who have the spiritual care of the nuns and the other inmates of the institution, as appears from the decree of the Sacred Congregation of Rites. (S.R.C. 4248 and III. *Ephem. Liturg.* Vol. XXIV, pp. 264-266.)"

WILLIAM J. LALLOU

INTENTION OF THE PRAYERS AFTER MASS

Question: Are the prayers recited after Mass still intended for the conversion of Russia?

Answer: As far as we know, there has been no change in the intention prescribed for the prayers after Low Mass since Pope Pius XI, in his consistorial allocution of June 30, 1930, commanded that they be offered to the end that Christ, the Redeemer of the human race, may permit tranquillity and the freedom to profess the faith to be restored to the afflicted children of Russia (*AAS*, XXII [1930], 301). It is well to note that in making this ruling the Pope prescribed that bishops and priests should often remind the faithful of this intention. The Pope's admonition should be faithfully observed, for there is at least as much cause to pray for religious liberty in Russia today as there was fifteen years ago.

BANNS FOR THE CONVALIDATION OF A MARRIAGE

Question: Is the publishing of the banns prescribed for the convalidation of the marriage of two Catholics who attempted marriage before a civil magistrate, so that a dispensation from the banns must be sought if it is judged unsuitable to publish them?

Answer: The only cases in which the Code prescribes the omission of the banns are a mixed marriage (Canon 1026) and a marriage of conscience (Canon 1104). Evidently, then, by the letter of the law they should be published even when the marriage of two Catholics, attempted before a civil official, is to be convalidated. Speaking of this case, Gougnard says: "If there is no obstacle, the proclamations are to be made before the convalida-

tion, in the usual manner" (*Tractatus de Matrimonio* [Malines, 1937], 623). Usually, however, there is good reason for a dispensation from the banns, such as the danger of scandal or the grave spiritual peril to the couple if the convalidation is deferred to permit of the three proclamations. But even when conditions of this nature make it advisable not to announce the banns, a dispensation from the general law must be obtained in order to render the convalidation lawful.

CONDITIONS FOR THE ROSARY INDULGENCES

Question: Must the lips and tongue be moved in the recitation of the Paters and Aves in order to gain the indulgences of the Rosary? I have been told that a recent ruling of the Holy See grants these indulgences for a merely mental recitation of the prayers.

Answer: The general principle regarding the recitation of prescribed formulas of prayer for the gaining of indulgences is that they must be recited vocally—that is, with the movement of the lips and tongue (Cf. Cappello, *De Sacramentis* [Rome, 1938], II, n. 973; Canon 934, §1). There are, indeed, special concessions for the recitation of an indulgenced prayer with a companion (Canon 934, §3) and also for the gaining of indulgences by deaf-mutes (Canon 936). Furthermore, on Dec. 7, 1933, a decree of the Sacred Penitentiary granted all the faithful the right to gain indulgences attached to invocations and ejaculatory prayers by a mental recitation (*AAS*, XXVI [1934], 35). However, none of these concessions would permit persons enjoying the normal power of speech to gain the indulgences of the Rosary by a mental recitation when they are performing this pious act privately. And, as far as we know, there has been no recent pronouncement of the Holy See granting such a concession. Priests would do well to explain these points to their people occasionally, so that they will not deprive themselves of the rich indulgences attached to the Rosary by failing to fulfil all the conditions. It would be fitting to explain at the same time that a *vocal* recitation is not the same as an *audible* recitation, that it suffices to pronounce the prayers with the lips and tongue, even though no sound is perceptible.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

Book Reviews

A COMPANION TO THE NEW TESTAMENT. By John E. Steinmueller, S.T.D., S.Scr.L., and Kathryn Sullivan, R.S.C.J., Ph.D. New York: Joseph F. Wagner, Inc.; London: B. Herder Co., 1944. Pp. viii + 328. $3.75.

Dr. Steinmueller is to be congratulated in his efforts to fill a need of long standing for up-to-date Catholic text books in English on the Sacred Scriptures. He has, with untiring zeal, within the past few years produced three volumes of General and Special Introduction to the Bible, and now he adds a fourth in collaboration with Mother Kathryn Sullivan, Religious of the Sacred Heart.

The authors state their purpose in a foreword: "The goal of the authors of the present volume is to reach instructed and educated Catholics, and by omitting or briefly treating the obvious to increase their knowledge of the Sacred Scriptures."

In successive chapters the authors treat very briefly such subjects as inspiration, the Canon, texts and versions, the special introduction to each of the Gospels, the prophetic witness to Christ, the teachings and works of Christ, Christ as Priest and King, the Apostolic Church, the Life and Letters of St. Paul, the teachings of St. Paul, St. John's writings and characteristic teachings, the Apocalypse, and in a final chapter controversial questions such as chronology and the synoptic problem. In two brief appendices there are a chronological table of New Testament events and the names and probable dates of composition of the New Testament books. A very helpful bibliography of Catholic books and periodical literature in English, and a good analytic index bring the volume to a close.

The authors rightly aimed at omitting all technical details. There are scarcely any footnotes or references to Patristic writings and learned treatises. These serve no purpose in a book for the non-specialist. If, however, an occasional reader is stimulated to further investigation, he may have recourse to Dr. Steinmueller's *A Companion to Scripture Studies,* Vol. II, of which the present book is a condensation. There the student will find an ample and up-to-date bibliography.

We think that in the text of this book too many words appear without explanation and will be unintelligible to the average lay reader, "educated and instructed" though he be. How many of the educated laity will know the meaning of, for example, such words as Vulgate, papyrus, Decapolis, Jews of the Dispersion, ligatures, lectionaries,

palimpsest, Diatessaron, Nazarite, charism, literal or typical meaning? This reviewer thinks too that it is an overestimation of the educated and instructed Catholic's knowledge to credit him with such a knowledge of Latin as seems to be supposed, since not a few phrases and sentences are cited in that language. As a rule they are not translated. Here and there this reviewer notes a rather loose use of words as, for example, in the case of the passage referring to Christ's Baptism, where we read: "Here in the theophany the three Persons of the Blessed Trinity are alluded to and in Christian Baptism they are explicitly employed."

But these are minor things. In general we like the book. We approve heartily of the way in which the authors introduce the discussion of the various Pauline epistles into the framework of St. Paul's life. We also like the summaries of the Gospel teaching and of St. Paul's doctrine, but we would have preferred to find more stress put on the person of Christ—His divinity. We are glad to see so much space devoted to a running commentary on the Apocalypse, a book which many readers avoid because they think it is unintelligible and therefore useless reading, whereas it is filled with instructive lessons and spiritual food that can easily be assimilated with the aid of such helpful comments as those given by Dr. Steinmueller and his learned collaboratrix.

It is always difficult to decide what should and should not be included in a book of this type and how simplified the treatment should be. The use of the book in classroom or study club will alone serve as an adequate criterion in this regard.

At any rate, Dr. Steinmueller and Dr. Sullivan have made a beginning of what the French call *vulgarisation*. We hope that they will continue their efforts at popularization and that others will follow their example, and in the light of experience produce similar and improved books of this kind, for their objective is noble, being to diffuse knowledge and love of God's written word, a source of great spiritual growth and development. The price of this book seems unusually high in view of its length and the quality of paper and binding.

JOSEPH L. LILLY, C.M.

THE HOLY SACRIFICE OF THE MASS. By Very Rev. Martin B. Hellriegel. St. Louis, Mo.: Pio Decimo Press, 1944. Pp. 66.

This little volume, the work of a priest most active in the present-day liturgical movement, presents the idea of the Mass as the sun of our Christian life, about which sacraments and sacramentals and devotional

practices revolve as so many planets and planetoids. The font, at which we were born to Christ, and the altar, on which the highest homage to God is daily rendered and from which we are nourished with the Flesh and Blood of Christ, are the two holy objects on which our eyes must be ever focused. The present work, while insisting that we must love and treasure both font and altar, concerns itself with the eucharistic mystery.

In simple language, with the text illustrated by interesting diagrammic pictures, Msgr. Hellriegel describes the Mass as it should be understood by those who would rightly make their devotional life Eucharistico-centric. He makes the division, now so well understood, of the Fore-Mass and the Sacrifice-Mass, with the *Credo* as a connecting link. In the former, man speaks to God in prayer, and then God speaks to man through the Epistle, the Gospel, and the homily. The Sacrifice-Mass is made up of Offertory, Consecration, and Communion. The author deplores the disappearance of the old offertory procession, in which the people actually carried their gifts to the altar, and intimates that much could be done for the popular realization of the oblation made at Mass by priest and people together, if the collection were understood as the outward symbol of inner oblation to God.

The Consecration section of the Sacrifice-Mass is logically treated in greater detail than the attention given to the rest of the Mass, as the Canon is analysed in a manner that will be most helpful to those who have not made an intimate study of the liturgy. The treatment of the Communion section is more summary but interesting in incidental historical references, not too well known by the faithful, and in the insistence on Communion as a "blessed triangle" indicating union with Christ and through Him with one another.

One practical suggestion of the author, which may be singled out for mention, is his commentary on the size of our "hosts," better called altarbreads. The usual smallness and thinness of the breads lessens in the minds of the people the fuller appreciation of the Holy Eucharist as the *Bread* of the strong. As to the material for the breads, the recommendation is for whole-wheat flour. Everybody is concerned about the purity of the Mass wine but seldom do we hear a doubt expressed about the purity and fitness of the altar bread.

This little book may be recommended both to the clergy, who will find it useful in conveying to the faithful an idea of the liturgical movement, and to the laity, to whom it will be instructive in bringing home the notion that their assistance at Mass is not as mere spectators but as actual participants in the sacred drama of the liturgy.

WILLIAM J. LALLOU

ST. BERNARD, THE MAN AND HIS MESSAGE. By Watkin Williams. Manchester University Press, 1944. Pp. v + 72. $1.50.

The first part of this book deals with St. Bernard the man and gives the "Story of a Life." To present the life of St. Bernard in 40 pages is no easy task. But Watkin Williams is one who can do it and do it well. His former study, *St. Bernard of Clairvaux,* was a work enthusiastically acclaimed by scholars and personally commended by the late Pope Pius XI. Now he tells the story of St. Bernard's life in ten short, rapidly-moving and interesting chapters. Here we see Bernard in his home life and then in his entrance into Citeaux, an event which was a veritable monastic blood transfusion giving new life and energy to the struggling Cistercians. In 1115 Bernard was sent to found the abbey of Clairvaux. It is as the abbot of Clairvaux that Bernard is best known. It is as the abbot of Clairvaux that he wielded his influence in history. In rapid succession we see Bernard founding new monasteries; helping people in times of famine; and in his relations with St. Malachy of Ireland. Beyond this we are given glimpses of Bernard in his dealings with heretics; Bernard and Abelard; Bernard and the Crusade Movement and Bernard as the counsellor of popes and sovereigns. All this activity made him the "Monk-Arbiter" of the twelfth century. Truly it can be said that to follow the course of Bernard's life is to follow the history of the first half of the twelfth century. Yet the important thing is not what Bernard did but the spirit that animated his actions. This life of activity was steadied by his life in God who "makes all things tranquil, whom to behold at rest is to find rest ourselves." After spending his life for God, Bernard found his eternal rest in God on Aug. 20, 1153.

The second part of the book is Bernard's message, his treatise on *Why and How to Love God.* Watkin Williams is convinced that this contemplative, electrically-active monk of the twelfth century has a message for the war-torn world of the twentieth century. In an Epilogue, Watkin Williams reminds us that there are never days in which it is right to loosen our grasp upon the great truth that life in every one of its forms is centered in God. The present crisis, although involving political, economic and sociological factors, is fundamentally a denial of the love of God, a turning away from the teachings of Christ. In extricating ourselves from the present melee and in building up the post-war world, Watkin Williams proposes as our model for action St. Bernard and the monks whose work was the work of God and who were disciples in the school of the service of God. Their aim was to live in the presence of God, but this absorption did not preclude interest in their fellow men. Rather it intensified it, man's true value being appraised only in so far as he is remembered to be the creature of

God made in the Divine Image (p. 47). The new world which man desires to rebuild is the City of God and we shall not raise its walls without reference at every stage to the Builder and Maker of it (p. 45). At present the air is full of "suggestions," but our only safety is to be found in the principles which St. Bernard so forcibly enunciates.

St. Bernard's message to the modern world is his treatise *Why and How to Love God.* This is the revelation of the secret of St. Bernard's own life. Put into practice by others it can do for them what it did for him. It is a reminder that God is man's beginning and last end, and that man as a creature of God is made to love him with his whole being. The choice of this treatise is fortunate. It definitely carries a message. Beyond this it is practical, definite, concise and easily understandable.

In the "Story of a Life" Watkin Williams makes St. Bernard live; in the treatise *Why and How to Love God* he makes Bernard speak; in his own plea he shows himself an idealist of the highest type and, in the final analysis, of the best type. A logical conclusion of this should be the great responsibility and important role of the Church in the present crisis, of the Church commissioned by Christ to preach the Gospel to all men and instil into the heart of man the lesson that he is made to love God with his whole heart, with his whole mind and with his whole soul, and to love his neighbor for the love of God.

ALFRED C. RUSH, C.SS.R.

EVEN IN THOSE DAYS

Notoriety, or, as it is called, newspaper fame, is to the many what style and fashion, to use the language of the world, are to those who are within or belong to the higher circles; it becomes to them a sort of idol, worshipped for its own sake, and without any reference to the shape in which it comes before them. It may be an evil fame or a good fame; it may be the notoriety of a great statesman, or of a great preacher, or of a great speculator, or of a great experimentalist, or of a great criminal; of one who has laboured in the improvement of our schools, or hospitals, or prisons, or workhouses, or of one who has robbed his neighbor of his wife . . . for the question with men is, not whether he is great or good or holy; not whether he is base and vile and odious, but . . . whether he has been canonized in the publications of the hour . . . "These are thy gods, O Israel!"

—Cardinal Newman, in *Discourses to Mixed Congregations* (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1902), pp. 91 f.